

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. MONDAY,
DECEMBER 1, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, as amended, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 1, 1969, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 26, 1969:

IN THE NAVY

Having designated Rear Adm. Evan P. Aurand, U.S. Navy, for commands and other

duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Lt. Comdr. Donald W. Stauffer, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of commander while serving as leader of the U.S. Navy Band in accordance with article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 26, 1969:

AMBASSADOR

Lewis Hoffacker, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Cameroon, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Ex-

traordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea.

U.N. TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Sam Harry Wright, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Bert C. Hurn, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Missouri for the term of 4 years.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

George M. Low, of Texas, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

U.S. MARSHAL

William C. Black, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, November 26, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

It is good to give thanks unto the Lord, to show forth Thy loving-kindness in the morning and Thy faithfulness every night.—Psalm 92: 1, 2.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, on this Thanksgiving eve we come to give Thee the humble and hearty thanks of our hearts for Thy loving-kindness to us and to all men. Thy goodness has created us, Thy providence has sustained us, Thy patience has borne with us, and Thy love has redeemed us. May we reveal our gratitude to Thee and return Thy love by giving ourselves in greater service to our fellowmen, in deeper devotion to our beloved country, and by cheerfully cooperating with Thee in all things.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9906. An act for the relief of J. Burdette Shaft and John S. and Betty Gingas; and

H.R. 14020. An act to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on U.S. savings bonds.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to adjourn from November 26, 1969, until December 1, 1969.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2276) entitled "An act to extend for 1 year

the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles under the provisions of the Clean Air Act."

AUTHORITY FOR CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday, December 1, 1969, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I believe most Americans, and indeed people throughout the world, applaud President Nixon's announcement yesterday that the United States would never engage in germ warfare. As the New York Times pointed out in an editorial in today's edition:

Unequivocal abandonment of bacterial weapons is especially gratifying, since this particular concept of warfare is as senseless as it is horrifying, disease germs being as great a threat to the user as to the enemy.

In my view, the announcement by the President, in which he also indicated that this country would renounce all but defensive uses of chemical warfare weapons, is convincing evidence that this country and its elected leaders clearly are working for peace for this Nation and for all men.

I agree with the distinguished minority leader that this action on the part of the administration could have a very

beneficial effect on the strategic arms limitation talks which are now underway.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY), who has taken the lead in the Congress in bringing the dangers of biological warfare to the attention of the Congress and the press, and the people of our country.

BETHLEHEM STEEL CORP. AND THE ECONOMY

(Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times in its Sunday editions carried a report of an interview with Mr. Edmund F. Martin, chairman and chief executive officer of Bethlehem Steel Corp., and Mr. Stewart S. Cort, the corporation president.

Obviously, problems confronting the American steel industry represent problems of national importance and concern. Steel's problems are problems of the Congress.

Because Mr. Martin and Mr. Cort have outlined the extent of impact of foreign competition and imports on the American steel industry during the course of this interview, and have cited, too, the steel industry's extensive involvement in the conservation of our environment through costly pollution control facilities and equipment, I believe all of my colleagues will be interested to review their comments.

I include the New York Times article in the RECORD at this point:

BETHLEHEM SEES FEW SIGNS OF DIP

(NOTE.—Despite predictions and some evidence of a slowdown in the American economy, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, the world's second largest steel producer, is enjoying a far better year than was expected earlier. It foresees only a minor decline in shipments for 1970.

(These observations were highlights of a broad-ranging discussion last week of the

outlook for the steel industry by Edmund F. Martin, chairman and chief executive officer of Bethlehem, and Stewart S. Cort, president. With other Bethlehem officials, they accepted an invitation to answer questions from Robert Walker and other members of the financial-news staff of The New York Times. Excerpts follow.)

Question. Mr. Martin and Mr. Cort, would you tell us a little bit about what kind of a year it has been for Bethlehem and what you foresee for 1970.

Mr. MARTIN. I think it's a lot better than we figured a year ago. We've had a lot more business than anybody in the steel industry figured.

Question. Why is that?

Mr. MARTIN. We've been trying to find out, and I think I have the answer now. Better than I had a month ago. We had an International Iron and Steel Institute meeting in Tokyo this year. After that, the president of the American Iron and Steel Institute, Jack [John P.] Roche, took a world tour. He went to Australia; he went to Russia, to Sweden, to Austria, to France, to Belgium, to Italy, and he went to Spain.

And he found out a lot of things that a steel man wouldn't find out. He's a lawyer, originally. The thing that interested me more than anything else was that the Russians say they're going to make 123 million tons of steel this year. And they have use for 150 million. They're trying to build up, and they're buying—trying to buy in this shortage. We knew that the Russians were buying steel, but we didn't have any idea that they were buying concrete bars and anything they could get.

Question. Are they buying it from you?

Mr. MARTIN. No. They're buying it from anybody in Europe that they can get it from. That's why we [the American industry as a whole, not necessarily Bethlehem] are shipping over there.

And that's why the Japanese are shipping over there.

Question. Is any American steel being shipped and finding its way into Russia?

Mr. CORT. I wouldn't doubt it. It's very hard to keep track because most of our shipments have been in slab form, and once they're finished in the hot-rolled bands and cold-rolled, you don't know where it goes.

Question. You say you have the answer, maybe, for 1969. Can you tell us about 1970?

Mr. MARTIN. All I know is that our commercial fellows—it's their business to study the market—think it will be almost as good a year as this year.

Question. Why?

Mr. MARTIN. They just think that the big customers that buy 85 per cent of the steel production—automobiles, appliances, containers and machinery—aren't going to fall off too much.

Mr. CORT. They're estimated to have pretty good backlogs, and they tell us they have very good prospects, and so our people estimate that total consumption might fall off 4 million tons. Which is less than 4 per cent of the 109 million tons we expect to ship [as an industry] this year.

Question. What is the net import situation? You're doing some exporting and, I presume, some steel is still coming in from overseas, but on balance has this thing shifted very sharply?

Mr. CORT. By the end of the year, the total net imports ought to be around 9 million tons. That's compared with 16 million last year.

Mr. MARTIN. The thing that worries us most about this extra business now is shown in another thing that Jack Roche learned from all these [overseas] companies—what their increased capacity is going to be. Everybody is increasing capacity. If Russia stops [buying], there'll be a tremendous excess capacity and then we'll be in worse shape than we are now. That's what scares us more than anything else.

Question. Is it not true that the dollar value of imports is down a great deal less than the tonnage?

Mr. CORT. Yes, the total dollar value, even with the tonnage down, is almost the same, if not higher.

Question. What would you advocate now? What do you think should be proper United States policy with respect to foreign shipments of steel to this country? What should be done?

Mr. MARTIN. I don't think the United States dares to let its steel industry go down. Look at Japan, putting all her money into steel. The Government works hand in glove with the steel industry. I think it's more the Government than the steel industry that's pushing it.

I don't think that, if the United States is going to be a strong country, we dare let our steel industry go. Some way, we've got to get Government help, because we're a private industry trying to fight foreign governments, and the job is to get this sold to the country, and that's what we're trying to do. We aren't doing it, but we're trying.

Question. What, specifically, do you think the help should be from Washington?

Mr. MARTIN. I think eventually you've got to have a government-to-government line-up.

Question. If there is no agreement on the Government basis, what will happen? Do you think that there'll be such a flood of imports of steel that you're going to be severely hurt?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, it's gone up to 18 per cent [of total American shipments] but next time it will probably go to 25 or 30.

Question. To turn to high interest rates and your company, what has the money market done to your own operations?

Mr. MARTIN. We're not different from any other company. You have to look twice at how you spend money. And we're going to. If you have to pay $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, you can't approve things that you would have approved two years ago.

Question. You have not gone abroad for money?

Mr. MARTIN. I don't know whether or not I ought to talk about that. We've gotten some. Not in any important amount.

Question. But you're not deeply involved in foreign money markets? As maybe some other steel companies are?

Mr. MARTIN. No.

Question. Have the tightness of money and high interest rates prevented you from doing some specific things that you wanted to do?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, definitely. We would be doing a lot more things.

Question. How is the removal of the tax credit for capital investment going to affect you?

Mr. MARTIN. Very materially. We're still fighting that. We think it's a terrible mistake for the country. We've fought it—every chance we've had. I talk to everybody. In fact, I even told Mr. Nixon the last time I got a chance—in a receiving line, when I shouldn't have—that he wasn't as popular as he was the last time I saw him, as far as businessmen were concerned.

Mr. CORT. People overlook [the capital investment problems] when they say, "Well, take your coats off. Go out there in the world market and fight these people. You're inventive and ingenious and so forth, and you've always fended them off before." They overlook the difference in the capital structures of the rest of the world's steel industry and the American steel industry. In the United States, the capital structure is an average of 25 per cent debt and 75 per cent equity. And anywhere else in the world, you find the reverse—75 or 80 per cent debt and 20 per cent equity. And people don't think that that creates a rather unequal area to compete in, but let me tell you.

The Japanese, in the steel industry, if they make $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent net profit on revenue dollars, they're having a fine year. At twice

that, we're having a terrible year. We can't pay our equity holders a dividend. The Japanese, at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, can pay a 10 per cent cash dividend to the few stockholders they have and the banks couldn't care less, as long as the steel people cover the debt service. So that if I were over there in Japan, boy, anything over that debt service would look like a good price—as far as setting your price in your market is concerned.

Question. Regarding import controls, what principally is the argument you have to meet from people in Congress, or the academics, who argue against you, that you can't take steel out of context, that you have to look at the whole world as one diplomatic and economic problem?

Mr. MARTIN. [Laughing]. Well, everybody in Congress that we talk to—from states where we have steel plants—is all in our favor . . . Seriously, we debate among ourselves what we should do. Should we go out and spend money to try and educate some of these people, Congressmen and Senators, from places where they don't have any steel industry or mines, to the problem in the United States? Or shouldn't we? And we just don't have the dollars to do it.

I think we've got too many things to try and sell. We have this under-depreciation, which is so vital to all capital-intensive industries. We have this problem of world competition, from people that have as much as \$40 per ton labor advantage over us. And now we're really having the people move in on us on the environment [pollution] control area.

Question. Is this costly?

Mr. MARTIN. To illustrate, over the next five years it's going to be 10 per cent of our required capital outlay. During the last five years, we've spent \$105-million on environment control and we face \$205-million over the next five years, and the very bad part of this is that for every dollar that you spend to put in these facilities the operating cost is a minus net revenue of 10 cents for every dollar so, at the end of five years' spending, this \$205-million will have \$20-million charged just to operate this.

Question. Is there any return at all?

Answer. Absolutely not. It doesn't help our quality or service. It's a permanently built-in cost. Everybody sits around and tightens up the rules and regulations and nobody addresses himself to who's paying for it. In the meantime, we're making a major contribution. And it's about time people recognize this. This is a total battle if you want to clean up the air and water. It isn't just the private sectors' responsibility; it's a part of everyone's responsibility.

Q. Question. Regarding Government economic policy, do you feel at this point, with inflation coming at a 6 per cent rate and so forth, should we have controls over wages, prices, credit?

Mr. MARTIN. We've got to stop these wage increases some way. The heck of it is that these construction people are really upsetting the apperect. They're just increasing 11, 12 even up to 15 per cent. . . . General Motors is going to have a negotiations next year, and what are they going to end up at? Are they going to take the construction into it and add onto it? I don't think we can keep on increasing wages the way we are and have a viable economy.

Question. Since we're again on a war footing in reality, would you at this time favor a return to a wage-price program?

Mr. MARTIN. Not presently. You can't have war and butter, and that's what we're trying to do.

Question. Which means that you think maybe we shouldn't.

Mr. MARTIN. [After thoughtful pause] Well, we've always done it before.

Mr. CORT. But it hasn't worked.

Question. Well, do we have two points of view here?

Mr. CORT. It's been no solution in the past

and if the present Administration will take a statesmanlike enough attitude, and stand firm, and slow this thing up until you've got 7 or 8 per cent unemployed—I'm not recommending it, I'm just saying "if"—I think it would be a more effective retardant action than the other. But it's political suicide. The crux of the problem now, I think, is the impact of a given increase in the over-all unemployment figure on the blacks.

This was not a problem that we had in the Korean war or in World War II, or at least if it was, nobody recognized it.

Question. Do you have any comment on the Government's tough antitrust policy and what the implications of this will be for business?

Mr. MARTIN. In a general way, I can just tell you that I think that the country would have been better off if they'd let Bethlehem merge with Youngstown Sheet and Tube. I think the country would be better off if they'd let Sharon [Steel] and Cyclops [Steel] join up. Here's two small companies that possibly could go out of business in the next 20 years, whereas, together, I think they would have been good.

I think in the beginning it was good. Sure, companies got too big. But here you take the Japanese merging the two biggest steel companies. Why are they doing it? They're doing it so they can compete better with us.

Mr. CORR. I think one of the bad things they're trying to do, or they are accomplishing, is this: If you are in an industry of low return, and it looks as though it's a chronic situation, and you have capital to invest, they won't let you diversify and try to improve the equity for your shareholders. We saw Cerro [a producer and fabricator of copper] as a way to end our problem. We went down and talked to [the Justice Department] for four hours, just three days before we got the adverse reading. And there was absolutely no competition between steel and copper. Even they couldn't find it after a staff of eight lawyers worked for six months on it.

And furthermore, copper is a critical shortage item in the United States . . . We demonstrated to them that there was a 100,000-ton-a-year copper development that was the first thing, if we merged with Cerro, we were going to address out capital and energy to. That would have been 25 per cent of the national shortage on a critical product wiped out. And they ruled it out.

Question. Then how does Bethlehem become a bigger and more progressive company? What can do it?

Mr. MARTIN. We think our ship building is going to pick up. We're one of the most diversified steel companies there is now. We're big in construction and we're pushing the minerals field all over the world. In minerals, I think we're in more places than any other steel company.

We were in Cuba. We lost that. We're in Venezuela; we're in Mexico; we're in Brazil; we're in Chile, in Liberia, in Gabon.

Question. How about buying into an auto company in Italy or France or something like that? Is that something that might be done?

Mr. MARTIN. That's something to take home and mull over.

VIETNAM

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, the depressing course of the conflict in Vietnam forces me to speak out on the subject. Up to now I have refrained from publicly voicing my viewpoint because I was hopeful that the natural course of

events pursued by the past two administrations would cut out this cancer which is endangering our Nation's health.

However, the war continues. At times I feel as if little or no progress is being made in ending this useless commitment of American lives.

I have always been pessimistic about the outcome of the conflict in Vietnam. It has been and still is a bottomless pit and the United States should start withdrawal as soon as possible. I cannot impress upon my colleagues how strongly I feel about this matter.

If they have been receiving the same volume of mail as I have from the citizens of their congressional districts, then they will know what I mean when I say that these letters indicate the American citizens share my concern over the course of the war.

The Nation is impatient. I want to see this war over with. I want to see our young men back home. Now is the time to end the war.

Back in September, the Meadville Tribune, a fine newspaper in my district, said:

The administration should move more swiftly and more vigorously toward withdrawing American forces and closing out this ill-fated venture. . . . the cold fact is that we have little to gain and much to lose by pursuing what has proved to be a mistake.

I fully agree. The only problem is that the administration has not moved "more swiftly" since January. I see little evidence that everything possible is being done to terminate this fiasco.

Back in March of this year I joined with several of my distinguished colleagues, of both parties, in sponsoring a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 187—which would state it was the sense of Congress that the United States begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam.

Some may say the administration has started to do so. But I emphasize that not enough has been done and more can be done. There is no earthly and logical reason to procrastinate any longer—let us withdraw now.

COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed by reports that the coal mine health and safety bill which passed this House is being weakened in the conference committee as a result of the outside pressure by coal operators. Nearly a week has now passed since the conferees ostensibly finished their work last Thursday evening. Since that time, there have been several unexplained days of delay while the final version of the bill is being written up, and it is going through several different drafts.

The past history of coal mine safety legislation should warn the Congress that when legislation is written behind closed doors, the special interests always win. Time after time in the past, the coal operators have succeeded in weakening

the protection of coal miners by cynically writing in the loopholes which have crippled the effective enforcement of the law.

Since last Thursday, what has been happening to the report of the conference committee? I have information that copies of each day's version of the rewritten bill and conference report are being circulated to the coal operators, and not to those most directly concerned with protecting the coal miners. Meanwhile the National Coal Association is using every inside contact in attempting to persuade the staff to insert a little phrase here, a weakening clause there, designed to water down the effectiveness of the bill. This is particularly being done with respect to the coal dust standard, which will mean so much in protecting the health and safety of those who work in the mines.

I hope this practice of slipping advance copies of conference drafts to the lobbyists will stop. I trust that the conference committee will reach a speedy conclusion on this vital bill and send it to the President for signature without further delay.

BUDGET CUTS REMOVE HANDICAPPED, RETARDED STUDENTS FROM PAYROLL AT MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE IN GREAT FALLS, MONT.

(Mr. MELCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the Air Force that due to recent actions of Congress in appropriations for the military, they have found that in order to make required budget cuts it is necessary for them to remove seven handicapped, retarded students from their payroll at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Great Falls, Mont. The Air Force expressed to me regrets that an admittedly worthwhile program in cooperation with the Great Falls High School in special education for these handicapped, retarded students must be ended. They tell me that this action, and I am quoting the Air Force "is in accordance with Civil Service Commission and Air Force regulations pertaining to reduction in force." The Air Force cites chapter 351 of the Federal Personnel Manual and tells me they have no alternative nor any discretion in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the costs of this program to the Air Force, the Department of Defense and U.S. Treasury was \$1.60 an hour for 16 hours a week, paid to each of these handicapped, retarded students, for which they performed worthwhile work in a commendable manner. It is necessary work that must be paid for out of Federal funds regardless of whether it is done under this program or by some enlisted personnel or other civilian employees at the base.

I am assured by the Air Force that this action is not their choosing but has been dictated by the action of Congress. They tell me that we left them no discretion in the matter and while it is regrettable and against their better judgment, they are forced to discharge the work-study students.

Mr. Speaker, I find this hard to accept and hard to believe, but since it is the story that is being used to defend the action at Malmstrom, and undoubtedly in hundreds of other cases throughout the country, I believe that there is a need for congressional intent to be redefined. Mr. Speaker, I called this matter to the attention of this body October 20, 1969, and stated then that I would try to find a way to help the seven handicapped, retarded students. I believe that my task in representing the people of my congressional district can only be accomplished by following the collective judgment of the people who pay the bills and perform all of the jobs necessary to make this country thrive and progress. I am sure the people of Montana and of the Nation believe that Federal spending must be curtailed in a sensible manner. But, in the enormous expenditures of the Air Force, the amount of money saved on these youngsters will never be noticed. It costs more than this annual saving every time one of the big SAC airplanes coughs or belches. There are undoubtedly many enlisted personnel impatiently waiting for the end of their term of duty, but kept on the rolls until the very last day whether needed or not, amounting to far more than this program at Malmstrom.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this House as the constitutional body of appropriation, to investigate the spending procedures of the military and other Federal agencies to make certain that legislative intent is carried out; to make certain that discretion and judgment prevails in curtailing spending so that the worthwhile programs are not eliminated. Our responsibility in the House of Representatives in this area is clear cut. Federal agencies blame Congress for failure to appropriate all of the money that they have been used to spending. Often they eliminate just such sensitive projects to create opposition to budget cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend a task force to study and evaluate the procedures of the agencies in making budget cuts and to determine whether wastes in detaining enlisted personnel unnecessarily, wastes in inventory, wastes in travel expenditures and many, many other places cannot be curtailed at least enough to meet our budget directives, rather than fire seven retarded, handicapped high school students who probably will have no other opportunity to be equipped for useful places in our society.

OPPOSING FOREIGN AID

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, following the recent hearings by the House Foreign Aid Subcommittee, it was brought out that the United States during 1968 borrowed money from 41 nations of the world. In other words, the United States is borrowing money from the American people to pay for commodities that we are giving free to foreign nations; thus, allowing foreign nations to build up their foreign exchange reserves and short-

term dollar claims. As an example, after giving Thailand billions of dollars in grant aid, we are now borrowing money from them. Last year, the United States borrowed \$100 million from Thailand to be repaid in 4½ years at 6 percent interest. Thus, we will have to repay Thailand \$127 million at the end of 4½ years to repay the \$100 million we borrowed.

This is a graphic example of how this Nation's foreign aid effort has deteriorated into nothing more than a vast giveaway program.

Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer is, understandably, becoming impatient and angry. On the one hand, he is asked to foot the bill for critical domestic programs which run into billions of dollars, while on the other, he sees his hard-earned tax dollars doled out to 99 different nations and five territories.

History has shown that our foreign aid program has often been wasteful and failed to solve the problems of those countries we were trying to help. In 25 years, the American taxpayers have given away \$182.5 billion—including the interest on money we have borrowed to give away.

We cannot survive indefinitely as a strong nation if we continue giving away our wealth.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that more foreign aid spending at this time can only contribute to our balance of payments deficit and add to continuing inflationary pressures.

It is my understanding that there are approximately \$18.8 billion in all categories of the foreign assistance pipeline—loans, grants, and credits—which could serve to carry out our foreign aid commitments for 18 months.

I strongly favor the elimination of all foreign aid appropriations for this fiscal year and the phasing out of this country's foreign aid program.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS CONFRONTING FLAT GLASS INDUSTRY

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the economic problems confronting America's flat glass industry are fast reaching critical proportions. The most recent blow came in the announcement last week that a major glass producer will close its No. 2 tank in Okmulgee County in my district.

The shutdown will result in 250 employees being out of work for an indefinite period, and if this trend continues, it will jeopardize the livelihoods of nearly 1,800 employees in this one county. The announcement stated the No. 2 tank was being closed because of low orders and high inventory. There is no question but what the flood of foreign glass imports into our country is the major contributing factor in the economic crisis facing the domestic glass industry.

It is of vital importance that both the President and the Congress be aware of the drastic need for restoring our flat glass tariffs to higher levels.

The U.S. Tariff Commission has held hearings on the effects of imports upon

the domestic glass industry, and is currently preparing recommendations for tariff adjustment to the President. I sincerely hope that the Commission goes beyond simply recommending that current tariff levels be retained, and recommends an increase in flat glass tariffs. It is essential for the survival of the domestic industry.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to welcome the gentleman to the fraternity.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman. I am sure it is a broad fraternity.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: VICTIM OF NEGLECT

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the performance of the Nixon administration on vocational education brings to mind Franklin Roosevelt's warning against "a Government frozen in the ice of its own indifference."

Perhaps this is too generous. In light of recent events, we can say that indifference is being compounded by defiance.

President Nixon and his miserly minions at the Bureau of the Budget have announced that they will impound the \$209.5 million in extra funds voted by the Congress to improve job training and education programs in the Nation's public schools.

These fiscal dreadnaughts seem to care more about cold ink in a ledger than about youngsters being turned away from industry payrolls because they lack adequate job skills.

By a unanimous vote the House and Senate passed the far-reaching Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. This bill authorized \$812 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969.

But, President Nixon requested only \$279.2 million in his budget message.

By this generous plea for America's youth and their anxious employers, the so-called "new Nixon" repudiated the "old Nixon." Speaking in Portland, Oreg., on May 16, 1968, candidate Nixon said:

I believe that we should set a goal for ourselves, that every youngster entering public high school shall have the opportunity to learn at least one marketable skill by the time he graduates. For too many young men, the end of education has meant the beginning of unemployment.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it sounds great, just like what the Congress had in mind when it passed the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. In that same Portland speech, the "old Nixon" led us to believe that his heart and mind occupied the mainstream of educational thinking when he declared:

Too many vocational training programs are geared to industries that are becoming obsolete and to skills for which there is no market.

It is partly because of this failing in education that teenagers lead the lists of the unemployed. Their jobless rate (runs) at triple the average rate. For Negro teenagers the unemployment rate hovers at the ap-

pulling fraction of fully one-fourth of the labor force.

That do-nothing budget request of \$279.2 million—scarcely above the fiscal 1969 level—made the President's real attitude toward vocational education like the title of the popular Broadway musical, "Promises, Promises."

Congress, however, tried to live up to the pledge it made last year. Through the Joelsen and Cohelan amendments to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, we pegged spending for vocational education at \$488.7 million. This is \$209.5 million more than the "new Nixon" thought was necessary.

Instead of zero funds budgeted by the "new Nixon" for work-study for disadvantaged youth, the Congress voted \$10 million.

Instead of zero funds budgeted by the "new Nixon" for vocational education for students with special handicaps and needs, Congress voted \$40 million.

Instead of zero funds budgeted by the "new Nixon" for research into improving vocational education, the Congress voted \$34 million.

The facts speak for themselves. The Nixon administration is defying the will of the American people and the Congress in the matter of strengthening and expanding vocational education. Even so puny a step as the national skills survey promised by candidate Nixon in May 1968 has been forgotten along with the other campaign rhetoric.

Mr. Nixon has now had 10 months to demonstrate his intentions in domestic affairs and to begin to live up to his lofty campaign promises. The honeymoon is clearly over in executive-legislative relations, and it is high time to tell the truth about what this administration is doing to weaken basic American institutions.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this is one time when I wish the "new Nixon" would heed the advice of the "old Nixon."

AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN MUST BE PROTECTED ON REVERSION OF OKINAWA TO JAPANESE SOVEREIGNTY

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, with the arrival of Prime Minister Sato in Washington last week, the United States and Japan appear ready to conclude discussions on a subject of vital importance to both nations and to the future of our alliance: the reversion of Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty. The imminent return of Okinawa to Japan fulfills the promises of all American Presidential administrations since the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty. It will restore to Japan what was once an integral part of that nation; islands whose people share a cultural, racial, and linguistic heritage with the Japanese, and who themselves overwhelmingly favor return to Japanese rule.

There is, however, Mr. Speaker, one condition which I feel must be agreed to before this transfer is made. That is the guaranteed protection of American

businesses in Okinawa following the reversion.

In the 20 years that the United States has administered Okinawa, and the other Ryukyu Islands, a substantial number of American citizens and servicemen have lived there to assist in the government and defense of the island and of East Asia itself. Millions of American Government dollars have been invested in the island to repair the damage wrought by war; and millions of private American dollars have followed with businesses to serve the American and Okinawan citizens of the island.

Today there are 107 private American businesses in Okinawa, ranging from a dairy company to oil refineries. Their total investment amounts to over \$220 million. Every one of these companies duly applied for and was granted an operating license by the Okinawan Government; every one of them operates according to the laws of Okinawa. However, these laws are different, in many cases, from those of Japan that will apply after reversion, and therein lies the source of potential harm to American companies if adequate care is not taken.

The American Chamber of Commerce in Okinawa has asked the President to consider the dangers of a total and immediate application of Japanese laws to businesses that have operated under Okinawan laws and within the dollar economy that now exists there. Their requests are reasonable: they ask that their licenses and leases be recognized by Japan, that they not be taxed retroactively, that they be allowed to convert their dollars into yen freely and without penalty, and that an American commercial attaché be assigned to Okinawa to bring any problems to the attention of both Governments.

These proposals are fair and should be heeded. In the aftermath of the harmony surrounding the announcement of reversion, let us not find that fellow Americans have been neglected for political reasons.

LET US NOT FORGET OUR CZECHOSLOVAK BRETHREN

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the continuing developments in Czechoslovakia which involved the removal of Alexander Dubcek as Chairman of the Federal Assembly and have constituted a gradual tightening of Soviet control are indeed sobering, for they are continuing incidents in the political tragedy that has been unfolding in that country since the Communist coup in 1948.

Forced to live under the harsh and oppressive regime of the Stalinist Antonin Novotny for almost 20 years, the Czechoslovak people finally began to enjoy a taste of freedom when Alexander Dubcek replaced Novotny early in 1968. For over 200 days, Dubcek attempted to set a course for Czechoslovakia which would have liberated the Czech people from a life of fear and economic stagnation. His government threatened no man or nation, most certainly not the Soviet Union, unless freedom can be considered

a threat. But this freedom was not destined to endure. On the night of August 20, 1968, Czechoslovakia was subjugated and Soviet troops occupied that country armed with guns and tanks.

Today, over 17 months later, the Soviet occupation continues. There are over 70,000 Soviet troops stationed in that unhappy country.

The Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia is illegal and unjustified. It is a violation of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. It denies the basic civil and human rights of the Czech and Slovak people.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should inform the Government of the Soviet Union that the occupation of Czechoslovakia is illegal and unjustified. My resolution would also request the President to put the question of the occupation of Czechoslovakia on every agenda for all future negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

We have been told that the Soviet Union would like better relations with the United States and they have in fact entered into arms limitation talks; that they desire increased contacts between American and Soviet citizens and Government leaders and a recent U.S. parliamentary group of which I was a member met with Soviet representatives in Moscow.

In my opinion such talks have a potential benefit for both countries. But the Soviet Union must be impressed with the fact that the United States cannot and will not condone the Soviet disregard for the sovereign rights of Czechoslovakia or any other nation, large or small, weak or strong.

If the Soviet Union is sincere in its desire for better relations, let it prove it by withdrawing its troops from Czechoslovakia. Let it prove it by turning over the affairs of Czechoslovakia to the people of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of my resolution.

POSTAL PROBLEMS MAY BE THE FAULT OF MANAGEMENT

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I again quote from the recent statement by Postmaster General Blount during his trip to the Universal Postal Union in Japan:

Japanese letter sorters can work almost as fast as U.S. machines because unlike Americans, "the Japanese haven't forgotten how to work." Postmaster General Winton M. Blount recently told a news conference here.

Mr. Speaker, such a statement discrediting the postal workers is regrettable. But it is even more regrettable that the Postmaster should compound this ill-advised situation with further derogatory remarks on his Department in the current—November 28—issue of Life magazine.

If the Post Office is "undermanaged and mismanaged," as the Life article

states, I am beginning to wonder if the crux of the postal system's troubles does not lie more at the feet of management than with the 750,000 postal workers?

Since the early 1950's, it has been evident to top postal management that numerous corrective procedures were needed.

The article states:

Soon after taking office in 1953, Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield asked for an operating statement for the previous month; he was told it would be ready in 17 months.

Mr. Speaker, Postmaster Summerfield had 8 years in which to correct the reporting and accounting system of the Post Office. Yet time and again during those 8 years he vociferously defended, in public, and before committees on both sides of Capitol Hill, the outmoded, unwieldy, tortuously slow cost ascertainment system.

It was not until May 22 of this year that top officials of the Post Office Department admitted before a subcommittee of this House that the cost ascertainment system was derelict and would be replaced by a new system.

I submit this was entirely an internal postal management decision. I also submit that when it requires 16 long years for postal management to make a decision on such a matter as providing an efficient costing system, that many of the postal problems developing in those 16 years can hardly be attributed to the American postal worker "forgetting how to work," as Mr. Blount states in his statement in Tokyo.

The article also snidely implies that Postmaster Larry O'Brien, "once wondered aloud about the potential of the carrier pigeon business."

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be selfish and reserve all of my "accolades" for members of one party. During the time that Mr. O'Brien was putatively the Postmaster General, he most frequently called me from his office in the White House—and though he may have become a bird watcher—especially where carrier pigeons are concerned—I seriously doubt if he ever maintained any close surveillance over the problems that were developing and multiplying in the Post Office.

Today the present administration fumes and fusses over the dire need for postal reform. But that same administration has given "marching orders" to withhold technical and administrative assistance from the House Post Office Committee which has been meeting for weeks now in an attempt to modernize postal laws.

I am wondering if, like the 16 years it took postal officials to abandon the archaic accounting system, it will require another 16 years before postal management decides to work cooperatively with the Congress in postal progress, rather than defend a pie-in-the-sky corporation structure.

Or, will the present administration continue to sing the Summerfield refrains?

In his first appearance before the House Post Office Committee, Mr. Summerfield outlined his major goals. He pontificated especially on his aim, "to

reduce the overall deficit of the Postal Establishment substantially through economics and modern management techniques."

This could well be a quotation from statements of the present Postmaster General.

The facts are, that during the Summerfield regime, the postal deficit increased from less than \$400 million to \$600 million.

Mr. Speaker, I finally submit that before the Congress would be willing to give postal managers a free hand, one that would remove the Department from the hegemony of the elected representatives of the people, that same management must present the Congress with at least some inklings of its plans for modern management techniques, a practical cost accounting system, rate increases that will do away with the shameful subsidies to favored categories of mail, a system of modernization through planned plant facilities and mechanization, and, most especially, firm guidelines for the protection and promotion of personnel.

DOT HAS A CARD-CARRYING CONSERVATIONIST

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the sting in my recent telegram to Secretary Volpe concerning the Everglades National Park, I do not believe the cause of conservation is forever lost in the Department of Transportation. Proof of this was brought home to me just yesterday upon reading an interview with the Honorable J. D. Braman, Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Environment and Urban Systems, in the pages of the Christian Science Monitor.

The article on Mr. Braman indicates that he is a man of wide experience in conservation matters as they affect primarily the Nation's urban areas and that he has the political acumen to accurately assess the uphill battle such a person faces in a department not known for much enthusiasm for environmental concerns.

The Monitor article asks the rhetorical question "is Mr. Braman a card-carrying conservationist?" Based solely on the article and the little I have learned of his determination to fight the good fight for the protection of the Nation's environment within DOT, I believe the question can be answered affirmatively. Moreover, we should thank our lucky stars that the former mayor of Seattle is in the Department; let us hope his conservation influence will spread—both up and down DOT's ladder of decision-makers.

A copy of the interview follows:

OPEN SPACES VERSUS ROADS

(By Robert Cahn)

WASHINGTON.—Big-city mayor comes to Washington; takes a high-level job in the Nixon administration; bucks the powers already established in his field of competence; finds unwelcome mat; but after nine months is still fighting the established powers, with only limited success.

This is the story, so far, of J. D. Braman, who left his post as Mayor of Seattle to take the newly created position of assistant secretary of transportation for environment and urban systems.

As a strong mayor and as chairman of the transportation committee of the National League of Cities, Mr. Braman had significant impact in urban affairs. Some observers predicted, however, that he would find himself without power to accomplish anything in Washington and would soon quit.

Though inexperienced in the rough-and-tumble of federal departmental politics, Mr. Braman is a scrappy fighter. In an interview with The Christian Science Monitor, he detailed what he considers some of his successes and failures to date, especially his difficulties with the Federal Highway Administration and the Bureau of Public Roads.

INTERVIEW EXCERPTED

Question. You occupy the only office in the Cabinet at assistant secretarial level that's set up to handle environmental problems. Do you think this is an effective way to deal with these problems?

Answer. Entirely apart from my interdepartmental duties that emanate from Secretary [John A.] Volpe's role in decisions of the Cabinet Environmental Quality Council, my job basically is intradepartmental. The concerns that I am supposed to be looking at as far as the environment is concerned are those in which there is an impact, presumably an adverse impact, from some transportation operation.

This boils down to the highway problem and to the airport-location problem. As urban mass transportation gets to moving forward, undoubtedly environmental problems will develop involving location of corridors, stations, surface facilities, and things of that nature. Also, from time to time something will arise in the Railroad Administration in which, again, a corridor might present some environmental problems.

Concern reflected

I think that the purpose for which the office was set up is certainly well warranted and reflects the President's concern for the affairs of the cities and his concern for the environment in its entirety, including transportation and its effects.

Secretary Volpe was well aware when he came in that inherently there was a lot of controversy in sight, with many people feeling that transportation facilities as they were being constructed were unnecessarily damaging the environment.

Therefore, he felt he needed a unit that could operate for him independent of his administration, independent of his other secretarial offices, to be concerned with two things—urban mass-transit systems and environmental impact.

Question. Have you been successful so far?

Answer. I don't think I was under any illusions when I came here, and I doubt that the Secretary was, as to the ease with which we would accomplish our objectives. It would be quite apparent to anyone who had been involved, as I was in Seattle, with, particularly, highway environment problems, that the Federal Highway Administration and the Bureau of Public Roads were not going to view us as a welcome addition to the department.

Engineer's approach cited

Quite apparently, we were going to disturb the established, long-range approach they had to these problems. I don't mean to imply that they were totally blind to the environmental problems—they were not. But they were operating entirely with the engineer's approach.

And it appeared to them, as I see it, that the principal thing one needed to consider in the environmental impact of a highway is

to make the highway's actual physical structure attractive—embellish it, put some cosmetics on it, perhaps do a little better job of contouring and landscaping, perhaps do something to improve the graceful sweep of the concrete posts, girders, and so forth.

I don't think they ever were very aware that regardless of how well engineered and how beautiful from a structural point of view or monumental point of view a highway structure can be made, it still doesn't answer the environmental problems that relate to the tearing up of neighborhoods, the taking of very valuable land, the contribution that it makes to air pollution as you bring a massively congested highway into the center of a big city. And to the highway people it seems not only the best possibility, but—to their point of view—inevitable, that parklands should be utilized as vacant land.

Each case individually

Question. Do you feel that parkland should never be taken for highways?

Answer. Each case has to be considered individually. I think there are people who are so blindly committed that they think you have to preserve everything just to preserve it, regardless of whether, in balance, it performs enough function to be preserved. But I'm very strongly oriented toward practical conservation. On the value of urban open spaces, I'm all conservationist.

But you have to recognize that some people are in positions where they have to make decisions that are based on practical considerations. Then I think you have to back away and compromise a little once in a while at a reasonable level.

Question. Are you still hopeful that you can make an impression on the forces you are combating?

Answer. We have already made a profound impression. But it's been more or less one that has disturbed those who have been running things their own way. We certainly gained something in New Orleans [where the highway people were prevented from putting an expressway through the historic Vieux Carré]. We gained something even in the Memphis compromise [when freeway builders had to depress at least part of an expressway going through Overton Park]. I think we're going to gain something in San Antonio [where an expressway would go through several park areas].

And I think that whatever we gain in these places can't help but implant in the minds of highway builders who are just now starting projects the idea that there's a new ball game being played. And that whether it's just this little office alone, or whether it's a whole surge of concern by citizens, which I think is coming, the highway builders are going to have to reevaluate their whole deck of cards. They will have to realize that they can no longer bamboozle everybody by simply saying: "We've studied everything and this is the best we can do, and this is what we are going to do, so do you like it—and if you don't like it, we're going to do it anyway."

Question. Do you think that all Cabinet officers or agencies that have anything to do with natural or human resources should have environmental assistants?

Answers. I think they should. But the problem is that, if you go to any of them they'd say they already have people advising on the environment. The Federal Highway Administration, for instance, has people who are concerned with the environment. But these persons are not at policy level. The difference is that in most of these places you are dealing with lower-echelon career people who just can't buck the system.

POSTAL CORPORATION PROPAGANDA

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House have made reference to public opinion polls they have conducted as evidence of what they call widespread support for conversion of the Post Office Department into a Government-owned Corporation. For example, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has stated that the polls indicate "massive approval of the Postal Corporation concept."

This, of course, is not surprising, depending upon the question or questions asked. The American people want reform in the Post Office Department. Through many channels of communication they have been fed a steady diet of propaganda extolling the alleged "virtues" of a Postal Corporation and giving the impression that only by travelling this route can there be meaningful reform.

If I were to conduct a poll in the district I represent and ask citizens if they supported a plan which would provide improved service at a savings in tax revenue of \$1 billion a year—as claimed by proponents of a Postal Corporation—there is no question of the results: the response would be overwhelmingly favorable.

The trouble is that such a question would be totally misleading and unfair, for a case simply has not been made to support the claims of better service and substantial savings in tax revenue, as alleged by proponents of a Postal Corporation.

On the other hand, I can well imagine the unfavorable response if I would pose a question such as this:

"Do you favor conversion of the Post Office Department into a Government-owned Corporation; a plan under which compulsory unionism would be possible, which easily could result in a 100 percent increase in the first-class letter rate, and reductions in service?"

Why, it is fair to ask, have so many people from the President of the United States on down suddenly become obsessed with the concept of a Corporation as a cure-all for the postal service?

The idea, of course, is not new. What gave it impetus was the report of the so-called Kappel Commission—the Commission on Postal Organization—created by President Johnson in 1967 and which made its report in June 1968.

As expected, that report came out four-square in favor of a Postal Corporation, and to many newspaper publishers throughout the Nation, that was it—a Corporation was the cure-all and the voices of those of us who happen to believe that there is a better route to follow were drowned out by the propaganda barrage in support of the corporate idea.

One knowledgeable objector, for example, whose views have not been widely disseminated is former Postmaster General J. Edward Day, even though he has provided sound and telling arguments against the corporation concept. As Mr. Day stated in his testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

To me, it is a remarkable fact that, in spite of the many objections which can be made to the corporation proposal, there has been

very little published notice of these objections. On the contrary, there has been a barrage of one-sided propaganda and Chamber of Commerce slogans put forward in support of the Kappel proposal, much of it—I am afraid—by people who have limited qualifications as experts on operation of large organizations generally.

At another point in his testimony, Mr. Day had this to say:

The members of the (Kappel) Commission were, of course, all important men. However, I think it a remarkable fact that not one of them had any background in postal matters. I doubt if the President of Campbell Soup Co.—who was a member of the Commission—would have been impressed by the results of a critical survey of his company by a group that did not include even one person with the slightest experience in the food business. The same can be said about the president of General Electric, of the Bank of America, and of Cummins Engine Co.—all members of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, in the weeks ahead it will be my intention to offer further comments in an effort to set the record straight concerning the corporation concept and to keep Members informed of the progress which is being made in the writing of a meaningful postal reform bill by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I harbor no illusion that my views will have the slightest effect on those in the publishing business and the Nation's giant corporations whose minds obviously are closed to any other idea except a postal corporation.

I can only hope that my colleagues will keep an open mind, await the bill which I hope our committee will report at an early date and then view objectively all of the facts—not just the one-sided propaganda of those who, in many instances, have little or no knowledge of the operation of our Nation's postal system and the problems with which that system is faced.

CHICKEN: AMERICAN STYLE

(Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, broilers are a major source of income to thousands of people in the Third Congressional District of Arkansas, which it is my privilege to represent. Arkansas is a very close second to Georgia, which still stands as the No. 1 State in broiler production. I am giving my colleagues in the Congress from Georgia fair notice in the spirit of friendly competition that we will be on their heels and may well surpass them in broiler production in the not too distant future.

In 1964, the last year for which census figures are available, Arkansas produced 267 million broilers. In 1968, statewide production had risen to an estimated 369 million. Far more than half of those broilers are grown in my Third Congressional District. For example, of the 267 million birds produced statewide in 1964, the Third District produced 222 million. My longtime friend, Lex Killebrew, executive secretary of the Arkansas Poultry Federation, tells me that that approximate ratio still exists today.

I wish to refer to speeches given before the recent conference of the National Broiler Council in Washington, D.C. There were especially noteworthy comments on the modern broiler industry by two distinguished Americans, Dr. Jean Mayer, the President's special consultant on nutrition, and Under Secretary of Agriculture, Phil Campbell.

Dr. Mayer said:

As a nutritionist, I always think that you people are the sort of acme of the application of nutritional science and nutritional technology to everyday problems. There is no one industry that has made more effective use of nutrition knowledge than the broiler industry. There is no industry that has managed to really quantitate or put into effect the quantitation of needs as well as the broiler industry, nobody who has been able to think of foods or feeds as a collection of nutrients in certain proportions with the sources interchangeable but the result being the optimum result in being the same as has your industry. In many ways, if we knew as much about human nutrition as we know about chicken nutrition, we would all be very much better off. So, I start by expressing my admiration for your past and present and, I am sure, future efforts.

As somebody who is particularly interested in public health nutrition, the effect on the human system, I may add that you have extraordinarily good food as well. We all need protein, we need animal protein, we enjoy eating it. At the same time we do have problems in this technological, very sedentary society, of both obesity and heart disease, and you have the great advantage of producing a source of excellent, very palatable animal protein which is low in fat, low in saturated fatty acids, low in caries, and it seems to me that the thrust of present research in human nutrition is very much in your direction. If you can convince people to broil the chickens or if they have to fry them, fry them in light polyunsaturated oil, then you are "in" as far as nutritionists are concerned.

The Honorable Phil Campbell, Under Secretary of Agriculture, said:

The thing about the broiler industry is that there is no more dramatic illustration to me of the free enterprise capitalistic system that has made this country so great than the processes by which this industry came into being, primarily since World War II. Of course, we had broiler production before World War II, but great strides and increases and growth of this industry have taken place since that time. This is an industry with initiative and drive; it's an industry attuned to progress; it's an industry continually on the lookout for new ways to increase its efficiency.

To bring the broiler industry to its present position of efficiency, many problems had to be solved. Of course, I could say facetiously that the biggest problem was your competitor, but that's what the system is. Anyone who doesn't believe that broiler producers are efficient ought to take a look at the statistics. Take feeding efficiency, for example. In the 1930s broilers reached 3 lbs. in 14 weeks on 4½ lbs. of feed for each pound of grain. Now 3-pound broilers are produced in 8 weeks with 2½ lbs. of feed per pound of grain.

In the State of Arkansas and in my Third Congressional District the broiler industry is bringing millions of new dollars to our economy, thousands of jobs for people who need them and an expanded tax base which is vital to satisfy the service requirements of our State. May I add that the industry does this by producing and marketing a commodity

that is tasty, nutritious, high in protein, low in calories, and easy on the pocket-book.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to my colleagues' attention these facts about the broiler industry today because the story of this great industry has recently been dramatized in a film "Chicken: American Style" produced by the National Broiler Council. This film is a departure in movies depicting facts about an industry. In 28 fast-moving and fascinating minutes this film simplifies the vertically integrated complex which brings to the American dinner table a plentiful supply of delicious chicken meat. The movie shows that this result is achieved through the free flow of cooperation between broiler grower and integrator which characterizes broiler production today. "Chicken: American Style" highlights efficiencies in modern broiler production undreamed of in the old and happily forgotten days when raising chickens was a part-time backyard exercise.

Most interesting to me was the subtle technique used in the film which quietly but clearly establishes the fact that the great progress shown by the broiler industry has been achieved within the framework of—and, yes, largely because of—the free enterprise system which allows for progress. It is not by accident that the film opens on a view of Monticello, home of Thomas Jefferson, or that the movie's hero, a broiler producer, has been chosen to impersonate Jefferson in a Fourth of July parade. But I must not give away the plot.

I want to point out, however, that Tom Banks, broiler grower-movie hero, is a family farmer whose family is obviously happy and prospering. There is much concern about the future of the family farm. It occurs to me that the business partnership between broiler grower and integrator has been one of the most helpful economic developments to have appeared on the American agricultural scene in recent years. This teamwork between grower and integrator has resulted in improved incomes and a better way of life for thousands of farm families.

The movie shows all this and much more. It whets the appetite anew for many refreshing ways in which choice chicken can be prepared, and the message of "Chicken: American Style" can make your heart beat a little faster as it illustrates the benefits of living under a system of free enterprise: American style.

It is a good movie, and I recommend it to all without qualification.

INDIANA STUDENTS OPPOSE IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL

(Mr. MYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said about the student's position on the Vietnam question. One of the most interesting polls I have seen recently was conducted on the campus of Indiana University at Bloomington, Ind. I would like to share the results of that

poll with my colleagues. The following article appeared November 20 in the Indiana Daily Student:

STUDENTS VARY ON WAR—MOST OPPOSE QUICK WITHDRAWAL

(By Daniel C. Beggs and Henry A. Copeland)

More than six out of every 10 students polled at I.U. indicated that they would oppose an immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.

This third in a series of collegian polls was conducted the week of Nov. 10 as part of a continuing program to provide readers with a more objective account of student thought.

A randomly selected group of 270 students were asked:

"Would you say that the U.S. should or should not withdraw immediately from Vietnam?"

They replied:

	Percent
Should	30.0
Should not	62.2
No opinion	7.8

There was a significant relationship between sex and the manner in which this question was answered. Forty per cent of all females polled believed the U.S. should withdraw immediately from Vietnam while just under 22 per cent of the males expressed the same feeling.

Concerning President Nixon and Vietnam, the interviewers asked:

"Overall, would you say that you—do support, do not support, or are unfamiliar with—Nixon's policy for ending U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War?"

Responses were:

	Percent
Do support	42.2
Do not support	38.5
Unfamiliar with policy	14.3
No opinion	5.0

As in the previous question, the women and men varied appreciably on their support for the President's policy toward Vietnam. While more than 55 per cent of the males favored Nixon's policy, his support slipped to 28 per cent among the females surveyed.

About the same percentage of students who said that the U.S. should not withdraw immediately from Vietnam indicated they believed the security of the U.S. was at least to a "fair extent" affected by political developments in Southeast Asia.

"To what extent do you feel U.S. security is affected by political developments in Southeast Asia?"

Answers were:

	Percent
A considerable extent	24.1
A fair extent	40.8
A small extent	28.5
No extent	6.0

Concerning the U.S. relationship with its allies, the respondents were asked:

"How important do you consider it that the United States retain the confidence of its allies?" They answered:

	Percent
Highly important	39.3
Fairly important	45.5
Fairly unimportant	11.8
Very unimportant	3.4

About the same margin of more than eight out of 10 students believed an effective military defense was important. When asked:

"How important do you consider it that the United States maintain an effective military defense?" The students replied:

	Percent
Highly important	44.4
Fairly important	41.4
Fairly unimportant	11.5
Very unimportant	2.7

Last, when queried about the effect of public demonstrations on peace negotiations

slightly more students indicated that they were harmful than those who did not.

"Do you or do you not feel that public demonstrations make it more difficult to negotiate peace in Vietnam?" Answers were:

	Percent
Yes—they do.....	47.4
No—they do not.....	42.2
No opinion.....	10.4

COST-OF-LIVING ANNUITY INCREASE

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to ease the burden for some of the employees who will be affected by the Department of Defense work force reductions.

This legislation will authorize a 5-percent cost-of-living annuity increase for those who retire after November 1, 1969, and before April 2, 1970, and whose retirement is based on involuntary separation.

The immediate purpose of my bill is to extend for a 6-month period a retiree's eligibility for the 5-percent increase. This action is necessary because the October 29 Department of Defense announcement of civilian and military work force reductions allowed only 2 days under the present law for dismissed employees to make the decision to retire.

Many employees found that it was impossible to make a reasoned decision of this importance in a 2-day period. I feel very strongly that they should be given this extension of time in order to benefit from the increased annuities accruing to involuntary retirement.

Because of the large number of Federal Government employees who reside in my congressional district, I have many constituents who will be affected by these reductions. These include civilian employees at the Naval Ordnance Station in Indian Head, Md.; Andrews Air Force Base in Camp Springs, Md.; Naval Technical Research Ship Special Communications Facility in Cheltenham, Md.; Naval Security Group Department of the Naval Communications Station in Cheltenham, Md.; and the Naval Oceanographic Office in Suitland, Md.

STEVE OWENS TO RECEIVE HEISMAN TROPHY

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to congratulate Mr. Steve Owens, a member of the Oklahoma University football team on being chosen to receive the Heisman Trophy for the year 1969. Mr. Owens is a gentleman in all senses, a team player, and a leader among his colleagues. All Oklahomans are proud of Steve Owens, and this member of the Oklahoma delegation of Congress is very happy to take this time to commend Mr. Owens on his many accomplishments.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. STEED.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding football players in the history of the sport, Steve Owens of the University of Oklahoma, has been named as winner of the famed Heisman Trophy. He also has been named to the UPI All-American team.

This annual citation, made after balloting by writers throughout the country, is the top individual honor of college football.

Steve Owens has set a long list of records in his 3 years as tailback at Oklahoma. His selection for the trophy is all the more impressive since it usually goes to a member of one of the top-ranking teams, and Oklahoma this year has a record of only five and four.

Among the national marks he has established to some of which he is still adding are these:

Most touchdowns in a 3-year career—54 thus far, with one game to go.

Most points in a 3-year career—324.

Most yards rushing in career—3,607.

Most career rushing carries.

Most rushing carries in one season—357 in 1968.

Most consecutive games with 100 or more yards rushing—17.

Owens is 21 and married, a business major. A graduate of Miami, Okla., high school, he was president of the student body there and won the Masonic award as the outstanding student. He played there for coaches Mac Buzzard and Bill Watkins on teams that amassed a 3-year record of 22 wins, six losses and two ties.

At the University of Oklahoma he has played under Coach "Chuck" Fairbanks on teams with a 3-year record of 22 wins and nine losses, including the Big Eight championship in 1967 and co-championship in 1968.

Owens is the second Oklahoman to win the Heisman Trophy, his only predecessor being Billy Vessels in 1952.

Steve Owens combines modesty and teamwork with unusual dedication, reliability, steadiness, and talent. All Oklahomans are proud of his record.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague for calling this to the attention of the House.

Steve Owens is a great constituent of mine in the Second District of Oklahoma. I know his fine parents, Mr. and Mrs. Olin F. Owens, and a host of their friends and neighbors in Miami, Okla., share our pride in Steve because of his many accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, Members will be interested in a few examples of how Steve won the Heisman Trophy. He earned it by breaking the NCAA 3-year record for total yards gained, 3,388; the NCAA record for most times to carry the ball in a season, 337; by gaining 100 yards or more—and often much more—in 17 consecutive games; and by breaking the NCAA 3-year touchdown record, a record that stood since Glenn Davis of Army set it in 1946.

Steve also earned national honors by being an outstanding gentleman and student. He is truly the kind of football hero

we can be proud to have our young boys look up to. I have been following Steve's football achievements since he played for Miami High School, and I have never heard anything but praise for him on or off the field.

Mr. Speaker, this week Steve plays his final game for Oklahoma in Oklahoma's annual classic battle against Oklahoma State University. I am certainly not going to take sides on that one, but I will be one of the many Oklahomans who will be pulling for Steve Owens to score at least one more touchdown and rush for at least 147 yards—achievements which will give him the national titles in scoring and rushing for this season.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the really remarkable things about Steve being chosen to get the Heisman award is the fact that he played on a losing ball club. Oklahoma lost four games this year and, yet, in spite of that he got the most votes for "All America." He was given the Heisman Trophy. As a general rule, receivers of the Heisman Trophy play on winning ball clubs. The reason for that is they feel if a man is entitled to the Heisman Trophy, his team should win its games. Steve made such an outstanding record he was chosen in spite of the fact that he played on a losing ball club.

Of course, he has been a great ball player ever since he entered the university in his sophomore year. I have watched his progress all the way through, and I felt sure that in his senior year he was bound to get the Heisman Trophy.

Mr. CAMP. I thank my colleague.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in congratulating a great Oklahoman, Steve Owens, a young man who is not only an outstanding athlete but also a fine student and a leader of men. Oklahoma is proud of him.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman.

WAS THE SEARCH-AND-DESTROY POLICY IN VIETNAM RESPONSIBLE FOR A MASSACRE?

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a day of great fame for my country and possibly great infamy. The painful possible infamy comes from some things that allegedly have happened in Vietnam in March of 1968, when apparently many innocent people were wantonly murdered. This, if true, will cast a reflection on America that is not good. I read by the papers that this matter is going to be investigated 20 months later. We need to know why it is coming so late. Hopefully, we will find out about that.

I read with great interest, I have listened with great interest to many of the

statements that have been made on this question already, and I along with many Americans feel, as articulated best, I think, by our leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), yesterday, a certain sympathy for the people involved. I have that sympathy, too, because I have a feeling that this came as a result of a policy that was adopted by somebody in control that did not have a good effect either on the problem, the resolution of the problem in Vietnam or on the mental attitude of our soldiers. That policy was of search and destroy.

Mr. Speaker, I know something about that policy, for 2 years ago, with a group of volunteers, 10 of them, American citizens, who prepared themselves well before going, I went to Vietnam and spent 10 days there, and a portion of the team longer. While there we divided into subcommittees. We investigated, observed, appraised, and made notes, and then we made a report to the Congress. At that time we recommended what has now become the policy. We recommended that the search-and-destroy policy be changed to one we would call "clear and hold." That, I understand, is the recent policy, and it makes a lot more sense.

Mr. Speaker, as the people who are investigating this thing look at this matter, I hope they will investigate the entire picture. Investigate, and let us find out who it was who enunciated the search-and-destroy policy, and this may lay at the base of our trouble.

So I am saying let us get the full story.

In my prepared remarks—and I hope Members of Congress will read them—I will expand on this subject a little more and make some observation that may be worthy of the Members' consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the reports of the last week regarding the alleged massacre at Mylai in South Vietnam is cause for concern to us all.

It seems to me that we should look beyond the massacre itself and examine the situation and atmosphere which I feel not only allowed, but encouraged an incident such as occurred at Mylai.

In March of 1968 we still were pursuing a policy of search and destroy. This policy was typified by the large sweeps through areas in South Vietnam where the U.S. troops supposedly sought out Vietcong and destroyed them. Too often, however, we had the specter of entire villages and hamlets being destroyed. And now we have an example of not only the physical buildings being eliminated, but the men, women, and children who lived in them as well.

While the actions of our young men in Mylai cannot be excused, there is no doubt in my mind that it was the policy of search and destroy which must share equal if not more blame. The Army officials who continually sent young men out on search-and-destroy missions knew that an incident like this one at Mylai was bound to occur. It was inevitable that the atmosphere created and built up by the search-and-destroy concept would result in mass civilian killings.

So rather than placing all of the responsibility on the young men involved in the incident just revealed, it seems to me that we should also call to account those who formulated and administered

the policy which fostered the atmosphere which led to the atrocity.

What now is equally disturbing is the indication that the same high ranking officers responsible for adopting the search and destroy strategy apparently have tried to cover up the results of that strategy. The policy was terribly wrong. The attempt to cover up is indefensible.

When I was in Vietnam in November 1967, we asked military officials how many people were being killed as the result of "friendly action." An incredibly low number was cited. It is even more incredible now. They stated that 374 South Vietnamese had been killed as the result of friendly action from January 1 to November 1, 1967.

When I returned from Vietnam I pointed to the utter failure of search and destroy. It alienated the people in South Vietnam we were supposedly fighting for. It was causing widespread destruction and death of civilians. It was killing a lot of American young men.

At that time I called for a change in policy to what I referred to as clear and hold. If this policy had been pursued it is unlikely that the incident at Mylai or others like it would not have happened.

It is gratifying to note that President Nixon has seen the mistake of search and destroy and has in effect adopted the strategy of clear and hold I recommended 2 years ago. It has reduced the level of violence, encouraged and heightened by search and destroy. It has minimized the likelihood of any more Mylai's because of the change in attitude and atmosphere. It provides a much better basis for eventual American withdrawal from Vietnam.

The lesson of Mylai is not that young men sometimes lack judgment or lose their balance, but that a policy and order such as were in effect in Mylai were wrong. I will be keenly disappointed if the investigation underway now does not cover the entire situation and does not examine the influence of the concept of search and destroy on what happened. I also will be disappointed if the investigation does not include a careful analysis of who gave what orders all the way up to the top brass. And if there were, in fact, an attempt to cover up, those responsible should be stripped immediately of their positions and court martialed along with the others.

In my opening statement I referred to yesterday as a day of fame and possible infamy.

I call yesterday a day of fame because the President issued a most significant statement on the use of biological warfare. This has completely changed our attitude, our position, and our posture. All sane and thoughtful Americans will applaud and the free world will begin to renew their confidence in America.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat President Nixon's announcement that there will be a dramatic change in our Government's policy with regard to chemical and biological weapons certainly is good news.

The decision to submit the Geneva Protocol of 1925, prohibiting use in war of poison gas or bacteriological methods of warfare establishes without doubt

this Nation's position on this important issue.

In addition, the President unequivocally stated our Nation was renouncing the use of lethal biological weapons. Recognizing that these weapons could produce global epidemics and impair the health of future generations, the President has ordered the disposal of our existing stocks of bacteriological weapons.

As the coauthor of a recent report which called for the actions the President has taken, I am pleased our Nation and our President has taken these forthright steps to eliminate these terrible weapons from our arsenal.

As the President makes these hard decisions, as he makes his pronouncement and as he sets high goals, I commend him and voice the hope that all Americans will take heart and give support to his farsighted programs.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION TO STUDY TRUCK SAFETY

Mr. Speaker, a good deal of heat, and not an awful lot of light has been generated by the proposed legislation to increase the size and weight of trucks. This is the second year the legislation has been before the Congress. It would appear to me, the most significant point developed to date is the woeful lack of accurate, unbiased data on the present safety record of trucks, and the effect of the proposed increase on highway safety. It also appears that we lack information, or else that available information has not been very well organized and presented, on the questions of economic benefits of this legislation, and the corresponding increase in the costs of our highway programs. With respect to the latter area, it is my feeling that sufficient data should be available through the AASHO road study, the cost allocation study, and other studies. The major effort that is needed here is to correlate the data and put it in more understandable form.

The principal area that needs further original research is that of the effect of this proposed legislation on highway safety. I first recognized this need during hearings on the truck bill in the 90th Congress. Despite efforts of proponents to ride roughshod over those with legitimate questions about the bill, it became clear we did not have sufficient, reliable data on the questions of safety. Hearings this year have clearly justified the position which I took last year. Testifying before our committee in May of this year, Dr. Robert Brenner, Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau stated:

As to the specific of what the extra width does or does not do in the safety picture, I am not aware of any work specifically in that regard.

I think we have to learn a great deal more about the problem of truck stability.

There is an awful lot we do not know about why some of these vehicles flip over and why some of them do not.

Mr. Speaker, this testimony is especially significant in view of the fact that Dr. Brenner would have to be classified as the one person in the Federal Government who would be most knowledgeable on the safety question. When the Gov-

ernment's leading authority in the area says that "there is an awful lot we do not know," it is high time we establish procedures to obtain sufficient information so that we do know an awful lot before we increase sizes and weights.

Even more incredible, but certainly in accord with Dr. Brenner's statement, is the testimony given by Frank Turner, the Federal Highway Administrator. Mr. Turner stated:

Our review of the available data bearing on highway safety considerations does not permit the reaching of a definitive conclusion—we do not have sufficiently reliable evidence to make a clear case for or against the proposal on safety grounds.

With the foregoing statements, the need for the safety studies proposed by the bill which I am introducing today appears to be quite obvious.

Mr. Speaker, the whole truck issue was highlighted by President Nixon's statement during the campaign last fall. He stated:

This proposal raises serious issues, including the safety and convenience of the motoring public. Questions remain about the extent to which greater truck size and weight would impose additional wear and tear on a road network.

I believe these matters are so important to so many of our people that I favor postponement of action on the bill now before the House.

As President, I would want this entire matter most carefully reconsidered. I would direct the Secretary of Transportation to take a hard look to make certain that the interest of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected as we facilitate the vital movement of goods in the Nation's commerce.

The bill which I am introducing would fulfill the requirements for study of this problem set forth by President Nixon in his statement. I would hasten to add at this point that no "hard look" such as the one directed in the President's statement has been taken. The Department of Transportation belatedly undertook a "quicky 30-day study" after hearings commenced, and after they were reminded of the President's statement. I am certain President Nixon would never let this "quicky study" pass as his "hard look," especially on the question of safety.

The bill which I am introducing today would create a 15-member Presidential Commission to take this "hard look" at the safety and economic considerations involved in the big truck legislation. The Commission would be required to report their findings within 3 years. Membership in the Commission would be representative of the many groups that have a special interest in the outcome of the legislation. The Commission would be directed to study all ramifications of any change in size and weight limits. This would include, in addition to safety, economic benefits to be realized, increased costs which would be incurred for our highway programs, and the Commission would consider the equitability of the costs of highway programs borne by various classes of highway users.

With the exception of the safety question, little new research will be required. As indicated above, much data is available on economic aspects and cost allo-

cation. The safety problems presented will require a good deal of new research. I am confident that with proper supervision it can be completed in the allotted time.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gross national product for the United States in 1968 was \$861 billion. This is over one-half of the world total of \$1,627 billion.

EVENTS IN SONGMY

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it would be inappropriate to celebrate the holiday we call Thanksgiving without saying something about the events in Songmy.

"Inappropriate" is not the word; I am not sure what the word is. We are dealing with an unprecedented situation, a situation no American ever believed he would have to deal with, so no one is really prepared to deal with it, to find words for it. Maybe "unacceptable" is as close as a word can come to describing the situation—I think that is what Robert Kennedy would have called it—but what does it mean to call a situation "unacceptable" that one must, in fact, learn to accept?

In any case I cannot sit here silently, knowing what we already know, and let it appear that the predominant response of America to the events in Songmy is a greater indignation at those who are finally telling us what happened there than at those who are responsible for its having happened.

One reason so many of us fell silent after joining in the demand for a thorough investigation is simply that words are so utterly inadequate, so pointless. It seemed almost necessary to wait in silence, horrified, praying that somehow it would turn out that these awful things had not been done by our countrymen, and praying for God's mercy on this land if it turned out that they had.

But facts pile up, and as they pile up so does a strange cacophony—a defensive ugly jumble of wrong noises and wrong silences, of buck-passing and minimizing, of impugning those who are reporting the facts and finding justifications for "no comments" that suggest a discreet condonation more than a wordless grief.

So, more of us must now speak out to be sure it is clear that millions of Americans feel more deeply grieved and shamed about the killings in Songmy than we would have thought it possible to be grieved or shamed by any action committed by men wearing the uniform of America.

Let it be clear, too, that the national shame will grow, as indeed it should, until this whole terrible story and any other stories like it are known; and until all those responsible, of whatever rank, are brought to justice. Further, all of

us will continue to share the guilt for the enormous and continuing tragedy that is our intervention in Vietnam until that intervention has been stopped.

What little there is that might ease the enormity of the horror of Songmy will be lost if these things do not happen soon. We are not, after all, Nazis. We are not Communists. We are not butchers. Lidice is not the way we wage war, nor the Katyn Forest, nor Hue, nor Guernica.

I include in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Washington Post and articles by two of America's greatest columnists. I hope every Member of the Congress will take the time to read them. They follow:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1969]

MYLAI 4

"You have to have been there to know how it is," said an Army rifleman who was there at Mylai 4 hamlet in South Vietnam when it happened—when an undetermined number of civilians, old men, women, infants, perhaps as many as three or four hundred, were apparently shot to death by American troops in March of 1968. We who were not there can only absorb slowly, and perhaps partially, the full horror of it, let alone comprehend how this could happen. Our guess is that Peter Braestrup, who was also not at Mylai, but who has been there in Vietnam, covering the war the hard way, close up, for this newspaper, probably has it about right in a story in last Sunday's Washington Post:

"The tentative picture . . . that emerges indicates that under stress, in a particularly vicious corner of the war, the officers of a tired, understrength rifle company, at the very least, allegedly failed to prevent many of their men from slaughtering hostile but unarmed peasants in revenge for the deaths of some of their comrades."

Stress? Particularly vicious corner of the war? Tired? Understrength? Revenge? Can these words, put together, explain the horror of American soldiers shooting helpless civilians, point-blank? The appalling account offered by Infantryman Paul Meadlo, one who was there, in an interview with Mike Wallace of CBS, suggests that, in a certain sense they can, that decent men can crack under the strain and the frustration of a brutal and brutalizing war. The Captain was there, Mr. Meadlo said. "Why didn't he put a stop to it, he knew what was going . . . he was right there . . . at the time I felt like I was doing the right thing . . . I lost buddies . . . I lost a damn good buddy Bobby Wilson and it was on my conscience . . ."

Perhaps it can happen; perhaps it happens more than we know, though probably not on the scale of Mylai. It is hard to say because there is still so much we do not know. What seems clear, however, is that it will never be enough to understand Mylai if one ever can, for this is not simply a matter of a court-martial of one lieutenant, or of whatever number of men in his command who may be under investigation now. This is not just something to do with Company C, 1st Battalion, 20th Infantry, 11th Brigade, American Division. This, in the most extreme form, is the story of the Vietnam war, and it seems safe to say that when we know as much as we can know of this event the American public's perception of the war rightly or wrongly, will never be the same again.

For the questions that are going to have to be answered merely begin with Lt. William L. Calley Jr.'s guilt or innocence. There are more terrible questions that have to do with a system and a state of mind that can allow nearly 20 months to elapse before so monstrous an event is even brought to light, let alone to trial. We need to know how, in a system which positively thrives on operations

reports and progress reports, no honest report of this "incident," as the Army calls it, apparently ever reached the high command. And how, according to reports in this newspaper, the regimental commander could develop strong suspicions that something had gone wrong and then make only the most cursory investigation. The suspicion arises that the Army really didn't want to know, that somehow an atmosphere has developed in which the unthinkable atrocity is of no great matter—until some conscience-stricken enlisted man talks and it comes time to find a scapegoat well down the chain of command. This is what we need to know more about—the system and the state of mind. For Mylai even at best, cannot be written off as an exception that proves the rule, as some isolated aberration. For all its horror, in a certain sense it is part and parcel of the war, removed only in degree from what is known to be commonplace: the indiscriminate killing of South Vietnamese civilians by American saturation bombing, by American artillery fire, by isolated infantry skirmishing. So there is no way that it can be ignored, even without the worldwide uproar it has produced. We can perhaps weather that. What remains to be seen is whether we can withstand the outcry at home, for the massacre at Mylai 4 can only make more anguishing the central question of our capacity in good conscience to wage this war.

THE KILLERS (By Pete Hamill)

And so it appears, as we move into the Seventies, that we have learned something about ourselves that is large and dark and final. We, all of us, sitting here in our small comforts, worrying about inflation and schools and the coming of winter, preparing for a night at the theater or a short passage with the Knicks, getting our cars repaired, swapping small talk at lunch, making Christmas lists, marrying and divorcing, wrapped in ourselves and our banalities, all of us must sleep tonight in the knowledge that we share in mass murder.

Can we look deep into those photographs by Ronald Haeblerle of The Cleveland Plain Dealer and deny what they tell us? That girl with straight clipped bangs; she is about 10, and terrified, hiding behind a shrunken woman. In a moment, she is to be liberated forever by the guns of Americans. We don't know her name; we don't know the names of those in the other photographs, piled in a field like cordwood; and we'll never know. They were "slopeheads"; therefore we can kill them.

One justification for the destruction of Song My is that the villages there were "unfriendly" and had been in the control of the Viet Cong or the Viet Minh since the 1940s. But we must remember several things: the Viet Cong were the only government that many of those places had had since the Japanese left after the Second World War. And more importantly, the Viet Cong are Vietnamese, before anything else. If the U.S. were to break into civil war, and 6,000,000 Chinese troops arrived to fight for one side (using the same ratio as that of American troops to South Vietnamese citizens) we would be unlikely to be friendly, especially if they seemed to spend much of their time bombing, shelling, mortaring, shooting and burning. You cannot expect people to believe your noble intentions when you shoot 10-year-old girls to death.

Ah, but "these things happen in war." Yes, and when a stickup man shoots a grocer in the belly we could say that those things happen in armed robberies. A guy blows his wife's head off with a shotgun; those things happen in domestic quarrels. A girl is raped and strangled; those things happen in an urban society. Lidice was one of those things that happened in a war and we hung people for it.

The Army will court-martial a number of people over what happened that March day at Song My. The defense will be the old one: they were acting under orders. But there will be other issues involved in that trial. Would they have killed those people so easily if they had been in Sweden? If you continually call a man a "gook" or "Charlie" or "slopehead," he is on his way to becoming an object and not a subject. He experiences no terror, no exaltation, no love; he doesn't sweat, feel hunger, suffer remorse; he doesn't care about seasons, or children, or home. He is an object who lives in a "hooch": he is a "kike," a "mick," a "guinea," a "polack," a "spic"; but he isn't human, and you are free to obliterate him.

There is another issue. Can a man legitimately defend himself by saying he was "under orders" if the entire action—in this case the war itself—is illegitimate? We seem to forget that the war in Vietnam was never declared, and is clearly illegal. We have something in this country called the Constitution which reserves to Congress the right to declare war. Our contract with the President uses the Constitution as its basis; every day in Vietnam, the terms of that contract are being violated.

But even worse, the contract we have with each other is being violated when something like Song My happens and we do not rise in outrage. This country was supposed to have a kind of fundamental decency at its heart; but we seem to have become at least as calloused as the Germans did. It is easier to forget it all, or blame David Brinkley for inventing it, or claim that "the liberal Communists" (to borrow the phrase of the wife of our Attorney General) were behind its exposure, or simply follow the example of the President and sit down and watch a football game.

But I hope that after this is over, we can remember some of the words of Sgt. Michael Bernhardt, who was at Song My. "We met no resistance," he said, "and I only saw three captured weapons. We had no casualties. It was just like any other Vietnamese village—old papasans, women and kids. As a matter of fact, I don't remember seeing one military-age male in the entire place, dead or alive. The only prisoner I saw was in his 50s." Were the dead members of the Viet Cong? "Some of the people were not old enough to walk yet, so I couldn't see how they could be Viet Cong."

But the government shouldn't get away with sentencing a handful of men, and letting the others escape. The others are not those baffled young men who were conscripted and sent to Asia. The others include everybody who had anything to do with sending them there: Lyndon Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, Walt Rostow, the Bundys, and all the rest, Democrats and Republicans, from three different Administrations, and seven Congresses. Throw in the people who make napalm, M-16s, and the other instruments of liberation, and we might have a trial that is logical and goes after the real villains. I know just the place to hold it. It's a town called Nuremberg.

WHERE OUR CONSCIENCE DIED (By Mary McGrory)

Song My has revealed the full devastation of the war. Song My has told us not only what Americans have done to Vietnam but what Vietnam has done to Americans. The country's conscience, apparently, died in that Asian village with the old men, the women and the children.

The reaction to the reports of mass murder by American soldiers have been not horror at what happened, but rage at the messengers who are bringing the news.

The South Vietnamese government, anxious to save the American presence, says it never happened. The American government, anxious to save the war, says nothing.

An administration which fulminated at

length against even the prospect of violence on Pennsylvania Avenue during the recent peace march, has no comment about slaughter in Song My.

The one expression from an administration official was given behind closed doors. Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, testifying in secret session before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said he was "shocked and sick" at the allegations, long suppressed by the Army. The White House press secretary says the President has not been involved in any discussions or decisions about the matter.

In the Senate, two members rose up, one to inveigh against the Army for bringing charges against an officer for "a mistake in judgment . . . under pressure of combat"; the other to condemn the CBS television network for bringing to the home screen a young ex-GI who said he thought he had shot 15 or 20 people under orders from his lieutenant.

The interviewer, Mike Wallace, was inundated by abusive phone calls. Of 110, all but two berated him for "giving that boy a hard time." The network received many messages, a typical one saying, "Agnew was right. Wallace is pimping for the protesters."

Americans, who once united to protest against the Nazis, do not want to hear about atrocities committed by Americans, who like themselves, have become moral casualties of the war.

The war first was presented to them by a previous administration as necessary to avert another Munich, by this one as a struggle for survival. The country has suffered three assassinations, countless riots. And now, it seems the moral standards of a small, fanatical, underdeveloped country have been adopted as our own.

After all, it is said, look what the Communists did at Hue. They destroyed 3,000 "Oriental human beings," to borrow from the terms of the indictment of Lt. Calley. The death toll at Song My is not known, but surely less and the blame reduced proportionately. The quantitative standard is almost certain to prevail in a war where the only known measure for progress, and oft-proclaimed, imminent success was the body count. They were "gooks" to the young soldier who helped shoot them, and Communist gooks besides, even the babies, presumably.

The President understands that Americans do not want to hear bad things about other Americans who are helping to save a gallant little nation from a savage invader. The day after the shame of Song My was proclaimed by the court-martial announcement, President Nixon held a levee for the press. America was abandoning germ warfare and would never strike first with lethal chemical weapons.

He not only told Americans what he had done but what they should think about it. "By the examples we set today, we hope to contribute to an atmosphere of peace and understanding between nations and among men," he said.

The image of a high-minded humanitarian nation was thus restored, by an action delayed 44 years, which the White House says is in no way related to the sick story of Song My.

Once before the administration overcame a report that laid bare the brutalization of Americans by the war. In September it was revealed that Marines had been tortured in the brig of Camp Pendleton, a Marine base that abuts the summer White House in San Clemente.

Four days later, Henry Cabot Lodge stood up and made a 49-minute speech about the inhumane treatment accorded American prisoners by their North Vietnamese captors, blanketing a simultaneous admission by the commandant of Pendleton that there had been mistreatment.

Since then, Americans have been conditioned to equate support of the war with

patriotism and protest with president-breaking.

Song My cannot be so easily bypassed. It is here to stay, a reminder to America that it is really not different from any other country.

A distraught young Wilmington, Del., church worker called this newspaper to say that, after reading the transcript of the GI interview, he thought the only way he could register his revulsion, guilt, and frustration was to renounce his citizenship.

"I read this sign on cars that say 'America, love it or leave it.' How can I love it when it does these things?"

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, since my early years in the Senate I have supported the so-called equal rights amendment assuring equal rights for women under the Constitution of the United States. I believe this to be a very meritorious measure.

Mrs. Adele T. Weaver, president-elect of the National Association of Women Lawyers, and legislation chairman of the Florida Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., has submitted to the Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, a very able memorandum in support of the equal rights amendment. I commend the excellent statement of president elect Weaver to my colleagues and to my fellow countrymen and include it in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

The Equal Rights Amendment Bill has been sponsored by at least 154 members of the House of Representatives in the 91st Congress. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs has been urging the adoption of an Equal Rights Amendment for many, many years, and the National Association of Women's Lawyers has consistently favored and supported the adoption of such an Amendment.

However, the Equal Rights Amendment has been opposed by those who take the position that such an Amendment would deprive women of existing "protective" legislation. This may have been a valid position in the days when the Fair Labor Standards Act was first enacted, when women and children worked ten to twelve or more hours a day in sweat shops and factories under atrocious conditions.

Times have changed, however; no one is now working under the labor conditions that prevailed in the "twenties" and early "thirties", and women are no longer in need of legislation limiting their hours of labor, requiring that seats be furnished to them, limiting their weight-lifting activities, etc., etc. What women need now is the opportunity to earn a livelihood in exactly the same manner and for the same remuneration as all their other fellow human beings. Today, more and more women support families or at least themselves, exactly as do men. These women should have the same job opportunities for the same compensation as do men.

It goes without saying that women are not generally going to apply for jobs that require great physical strength and prowess. Moreover, it is a known fact that frequently women must and do exert a good deal of physical energy, many of them lifting thirty-

five and fifty pound children without the prohibition of any "protective" legislation. If weight-lifting, for example is a bona fide job requirement, then women as a sex should not be eliminated from qualifying for the particular job, but their individual capabilities should be taken into consideration in exactly the same manner as would the physical capabilities of any man applying for that position. Moreover, any "protective" legislation that exists should apply equally to men and women. The various restrictive State Laws that now exist only serve to deprive women of their right to employment in certain occupations for which they might otherwise be fully qualified.

An Equal Rights Amendment would, of course, make women eligible for jury service on the same basis as men. We have already enacted such a statute in Florida as have other states. Naturally, a woman with little children could be excused the same as are men for various other reasons.

With regard to military service, Congress already has the power to include women in any conscription, if it so sees fit. While an Equal Rights Amendment would make women eligible for selection on the same basis as men, there is no reason why healthy young women should not be required to serve their government in a capacity suited to their physical and mental abilities.

The family relationship would not be altered by an Equal Rights Amendment: While women do not now have the legal responsibility for supporting their children, they do have such a moral responsibility and they do in fact assume the responsibility of support where it is not forthcoming from the father. As far as child custody is concerned, an Equal Rights Amendment will not change the basis for the judicial determination of what is best for the welfare of the child, the criterion that is now universally recognized by American courts. As to alimony or support of one spouse by the other after divorce or separation, where based on actual economic dependency or relative ability or inability to provide family support, it would not be prohibited by the Amendment since the criterion would not be sex, but economic need.

While women should be entitled to "equal protection" under the 14th Amendment and "due process" under the 5th Amendment to the United States Constitution, no Supreme Court decision has ever been rendered holding that laws classifying persons on the basis of sex are unreasonable and unconstitutional. A constitutional amendment is needed, therefore, to insure comparable treatment of the sexes before the law.

LETTER TO DADDY

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the city council of Tampa has brought to my attention a very inspiring letter written by Miss Betsy Bryant. I think it would be proper for all Members of Congress to read this letter, particularly in these days of stress, and when so much is said concerning the alleged lack of patriotism and respect of family of our younger generation.

Mr. Speaker, Col. Charles Bryant died over a year ago while on duty with the U.S. Air Force. This letter by his daughter Betsy is an appropriate tribute to her fine father and also to her country. I know Betsy and I know the deep feeling she and the rest of her family had for Colonel Bryant. This letter was written for Veterans Day in connection with an observance of this day by Betsy's school.

I am sure that the reading of it will mean a great deal to all of the Members of the House of Representatives. The letter follows:

NOVEMBER 11, 1969.

DEAR DADDY: Today is Veteran's Day, and though you aren't here physically to honor this day, I know that your thoughts are with us all. This day has never before meant as much to me as it has today. I guess that's because before I never realized what America and what we're fighting for really stood for. Today at school we had a morning assembly to honor the living and dead veterans of all the wars. I've never been as proud of my country or my school as I was today. Watching all of the students standing silently as the flag was raised to halfmast, I felt truly touched and I could feel my heart swelling with pride. I think I might even have felt some of the pride you had carried throughout your life, here on earth. You would have been proud of me today, Dad, and of our school. It was like all of the students could have overcome anything under the unity we stood under today. When they played "Taps" tears filled my eyes, but they weren't tears of sadness, they were tears of gratitude to a country and a heritage that I'm proud of and that I'd fight for if the case should ever arise. No, perhaps they were sad in a sense, but only sad because of the evils of war and fighting and the high price you had to pay for liberty and the freedom to live. And too, they were sad for you. In my own selfish way, I prayed for your presence to be with me this morning. I've never before been so proud, Dad, never. And most of all, I was proud of you. Proud for what you've done to help this whole country in their pursuit for a completely free world. Even though what you did in a life time is only part of this big world and the life we live, it will never be forgotten in days and years to come.

I know it's crazy to write to you since you've been gone for over a year, but I know that you can see and understand this from where you are. Today we honor you and 38 million other veterans of the wars and pray that peace will someday reign over hate and fighting. Help us win that war we fight in Viet Nam, Dad, and pray for us all down here. Put in a good word for the United States of America with your "C.O." up there, and stick by home today. Even though your presence won't be felt physically, your spiritual presence will be. You can feel pride and patriotism no matter what, and I know no matter what, you haven't lost yours.

We all miss you.

Lovingly,

BETSY.

(NOTE.—This is a copy of a letter written by an American teenager to her father who died while serving the Nation in the United States Air Force. Betsy Bryant wrote this letter more than a year after the death of her father, Col. Charles S. Bryant.)

MAJOR ROWE, VIETNAM VETERAN

(Mr. RUPPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to have a long, personal discussion with Maj. James N. Rowe. I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for having this young man made available to me and my colleagues. Certainly it is beneficial to talk with someone who has had the experiences Major Rowe has and I feel that I have benefited from having talked with the major.

It is hoped that it will be possible for Major Rowe to return to Washington so that more Members of Congress will have

the opportunity to talk with him. I consider it most important, especially at this time, for those in the position of making policy and those in the position of carrying out policy, to have an awareness of all the aspects involved in Vietnam. Major Rowe has presented us with an opportunity to have access to an area before unavailable to us.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF DECEMBER 1

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we will, of course, adjourn under the resolution heretofore agreed to until Monday, upon termination of business today.

Monday is Consent Calendar Day, and there is one suspension, H.R. 14517, Joint Funding Simplification Act of 1969.

We have programed for Monday and Tuesday—Tuesday being Private Calendar Day also—the House joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1970, and House Resolution 613, toward peace with justice in Vietnam. We expect to begin consideration of the latter resolution on Monday and probably will finish it on Tuesday.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, we will have H.R. 12321, Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969, subject to a rule being granted. I understand the Committee on Rules will consider that bill on Tuesday, and we expect the bill to take 3 full days.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as I gather from the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma, we will dispose of the rule on House Resolution 613 on Monday and at least part of the debate, and undoubtedly vote on final passage on Tuesday sometime.

Mr. ALBERT. It appears that is the way we will do it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to find a closed rule has been granted on House Resolution 613. I supported this resolution in the Foreign Affairs Committee and expect to support it on the floor of the House, but I can see no reason why, on a resolution involving policy as vital as this resolution deals, it should be brought into the House floor under a closed rule.

We had the opportunity in the House Foreign Affairs Committee to work our will on the resolution, including the opportunity to offer amendments. That right ought to be accorded all Members of the House.

I, for one, will vote against ordering the previous question in order to permit the House to work its will upon this highly important resolution.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me respond, if I may. I believe all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle did get the communication from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) pointing out that historically within the last 5 to 10 years, we have had other comparable resolutions brought from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In each instance it was brought to the floor of the House under a closed rule. I believe the precedents are on the side of such a rule. I personally support the action of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WALDIE. May I say I thoroughly concur with the gentleman from Iowa in his criticism of the rule that brings this measure to the floor.

May I say also it does seem to me if the purpose of the resolution is to indicate to the President and to those in Paris on the other side that the country is behind the President's policy in resolving this conflict, then to deny this legislative body the opportunity to examine into and vote upon the differences, the agreements and disagreements on that resolution, seems to me to be acting entirely contrary to the purpose of the resolution, and it would seem to me it would be interpreted by the other side as an attempt to stifle dissent in this legislative body, not an attempt to mold unity in the country.

I could not agree more with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to make the point, in addition to concurring with the gentleman from Iowa in his comments on the closed rule, that our research indicated any previous Foreign Affairs Committee resolutions which were considered under a closed rule were such that the committee invariably had hearings on those resolutions so that the sponsors of the resolutions could be questioned as to their intent, and so witnesses could be called before the Committee on Foreign Affairs to testify on those resolutions.

In this case no such hearings were held by the Foreign Affairs Committee in spite of the efforts of some of the members of that committee, including myself, to see that hearings would be held.

I believe the precedents the gentleman from Michigan cited are not apt. I certainly will join with the gentleman from Iowa in opposing the closed rule on Monday.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I would simply support what the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has said about the pro-

posed closed rule. In this situation, as in so many others, this House is indebted to him for his courage and independence for his basic commitment to fair procedures and his willingness to fight for them.

As my distinguished colleague from New York has pointed out, there have been no hearings on the proposed resolution. There is, to say it gently, a certain confusion about what its language means.

Perhaps this confusion is unintentional. Perhaps it has its purposes. If it has purposes, perhaps one of them could be to get as much support as possible by leaving a certain vagueness about the meaning and intent of the resolution. That would ease the mystery of no hearings and closed rules. It would not make them less objectionable.

If we do not have the opportunity for adequate debate and to consider amendments on this of all resolutions, we will simply subject these proceedings to further ridicule. Members not permitted to speak here will not thereby be silenced. They will be angered. Members who cannot propose amendments will not be "unified" by steamroller. They will be more inclined to vote against the steamroller. Nor will all this add even to a facade of national unity.

This is the most pressing question the American people have faced in a long time. We mock democracy when we treat it as if it were a footnote to a bill about fishing rights on Mars. We demean the House of Representatives.

I wonder what possible objection the leadership can have to defeating the previous question so we can debate and amend as the elected representatives of a free people should. That kind of respect for democratic practice might even improve the prospects for some kind of genuine national rapprochement at least on the question of how a free people should decide policy when they are deeply divided about what policy to follow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I can only speak for myself, and let me say there will be an hour of debate on the rule, during which time the views expressed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM), and others can be developed, if they differ with the recommendation of the Committee on Rules. Then the House will have an opportunity to work its will on a vote on the previous question.

If the previous question is defeated, then of course it would be an open rule. If it is not, there will still be 4 hours of general debate, where the pros and cons of the resolution can be discussed in detail.

I believe the House will have an opportunity on Monday and Tuesday to work its will, and individual Members will have an opportunity to express themselves.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am one of those who signed that letter. I support the President's November 3 speech. I support the program that he has brought

before the country. I believe it is the only meaningful way we can find a disengagement from this war.

I would say to my colleague, whom I respect very highly, and to the leadership, that we would make a great mistake if we tried to bring this resolution in under a closed rule. We ought to take our chances on this floor. I have full confidence in the membership of this House in working its will.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that we would not on such a crucial issue foreclose those who feel that they would want to offer amendments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, so I may finish what I was saying when the time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) expired, I say it would be a great mistake if you tried to close off debate on that resolution.

I know this House will work its will. I intend to support the President and I have reason to believe that the majority will support the President as have the 300 who signed that letter. But I do not want to give anyone the opportunity to say that somehow or other we foreclosed the opportunity to amend that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to associate myself with the views of those who oppose a closed rule on this momentous question that we face next week. A great many Members of the House are very anxious to support their President in an effort to find a just solution to this war. I think some of them have some pretty good ideas as to how to do it, and I think they should have an opportunity to express those ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON BACTERIOLOGICAL WARFARE

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the President on his statement

of yesterday on the subject of bacteriological warfare. It was a statesmanlike thing to do.

I also take pleasure in paying tribute at this time to our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY), who has played such a major role in bringing this development to pass. He has taken the lead from the beginning, acting with great courage and vigor. Although he has had the active support of many other Members of this body, he is entitled to the lion's share of the credit for what happened yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note that Mr. McCARTHY's role was explicitly noted in the New York Times and in the Washington Post of today in the editorials which follow:

[From the New York Times]

GERM WARRIORS RETIRED

The Administration's unilateral renunciation of germ warfare and its reaffirmation that the United States will never be the first to use lethal gases is a welcome move that should raise President Nixon's prestige at home and American prestige abroad. The unequivocal abandonment of bacterial weapons is especially gratifying, since this particular concept of warfare is as senseless as it is horrifying, disease germs being as great a threat to the user as to the enemy. Since even in peacetime it poses a threat of accidental epidemics, it is particularly reassuring to have the President's pledge to destroy the army's entire stockpile of germ missiles.

As for chemicals, Mr. Nixon is asking only for ratification of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which prohibits first use. Unofficially this has been national policy all along—with certain exceptions. Those exceptions, now in evidence in Vietnam, are tear gas and various defoliant chemicals. We regret that the President failed specifically to include these as coming within the scope of the Geneva declaration. The next best hope is that the Senate will express its understanding of their inclusion if and when it ratifies that 44-year-old agreement, as Majority Leader Mansfield seems confident it will.

The tear gas in use today, CS-2, is really a lung gas, far more painful than the simple chemical used when the Geneva Protocol was drawn up—and it has been used in Vietnam to flush enemy soldiers out of hiding places so they can be shot down. The defoliants are triply reprehensible in that they destroy food supply far into the future, upset the ecology and threaten future generations with deformity.

Nevertheless, the President's action is a major step forward and a credit to the Administration. When credits on this score are being distributed, incidentally, it would be grossly unfair to omit the name of Representative Richard D. McCarthy, Democrat, of New York. More than any other man, the Buffalo Congressman took the initiative in revealing the dangers and follies of chemical and biological warfare, exposed the extent of the stockpiling, and fought, sometimes singlehandedly, for the renunciation that is now official policy.

[From the Washington Post]

A HISTORIC DECISION TO RENOUNCE GERM WARFARE

For decades the United States has been mindlessly and massively preparing itself to use disease as a weapon of war, despite all the horror summoned up by bacteriological devastation, all the threats it poses to user as well as target, all the irresponsibility involved in tampering with the health of the human race. Now President Nixon has declared that the United States will renounce biological warfare, cut back its BW

research to "defensive measures such as immunization and safety," and undertake to dispose of its BW stocks.

The decision is a historic one. In making it, the President took hold of an enterprise that had been abandoned years ago to its practitioners in the military bureaucracy. He examined it systematically, and—like other students of the matter—discovered that BW posed great dangers to the general health and no advantages to the national security. Then, defying the established behavior patterns of Washington, Mr. Nixon acted swiftly and decisively on his findings: he abolished the American BW programs. Such a performance is as refreshing as it is rare. Every American can take pride that his government intends to stop its part in what Congressman Richard McCarthy calls, in the title of his new book on the matter (published today), "The Ultimate Folly."

Of quite another order is Mr. Nixon's decision to ask the Senate to ratify the Geneva Protocol of 1925. The principal instrument of international restraint on biological and chemical attack, the protocol prohibits the first use in war of "asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and of bacteriological methods of warfare." The United States has suffered serious diplomatic and moral embarrassment from its failure to approve the protocol until now.

Mr. Nixon damages his initiative somewhat by reserving the right to employ the tear gases and chemical defoliants widely used in Vietnam. Many Americans, and most countries which have accepted the Geneva Protocol, believe that those items should not be excluded from protocol coverage. They will surely argue against unilateral interpretation which has the effect of legitimizing practices they question. The pressure on the White House to submit the Geneva Protocol for ratification has been great. But the important point is not ratification; it is the practices the protocol regulates. If Mr. Nixon feels that the exigencies of the Vietnam war require continued use there of tear gas and herbicides, then he might do better to go slow on the protocol until the international community comes near to a consensus on its application. His pledge to renounce not only "lethal" but "incapacitating" chemical weapons suggests the pitfalls: a herbicide which destroys one's foods has aspects of the "lethal" and the "incapacitating," as does a tear gas which drives one out of a bunker into the range of an iron bomb.

While a President is responsible for his own decisions, the role of Congressman McCarthy in those on CBW is too great to be ignored. From a layman's shock at his first glance at CBW, Mr. McCarthy proceeded to inform himself thoroughly about it, to break through much of the military's thick shrouds of secrecy, and to rouse the public to many of the implications and perils. While a combination of circumstances and accidents help him in his task, his own clarity of conscience and soberness of method underlay his success. The country owes Richard McCarthy an immense debt.

THE EVENTS AT PINKVILLE

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion and debate all over the world and in our country today about the massacre that occurred at Pinkville. The wanton destruction of civilians was abhorrent and no one can ever justify that kind of conduct. However, I hope what happened at Pinkville will not overshadow the atrocities com-

mitted by the Communists over the years in South Vietnam, highlighted, perhaps, by the monstrous massacre committed by the Communists at Hue which I recently compared to the massacre at Katyn Forest also committed by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, I am not about to defend the conduct which occurred at Pinkville, but I think those who have been trying to try this case ought to be mindful of the fact that the Nuremberg trials established a principle that it is no longer a defense to such crimes simply because you were carrying out military orders.

I think we ought to realize that a lot of young Americans may be seriously jeopardizing themselves by the manner in which they discuss these events and are subjecting themselves to prosecution under the doctrine of Nuremberg.

I believe the Defense Department has taken the right action in calling for a full-scale investigation into the facts of the massacre at Pinkville. I believe that if there are charges to be brought against those responsible they should be brought, and they should be tried, but I would suggest some of our colleagues to be mindful of the fact that the whole Pinkville affair may have far-reaching consequences. I hope those who are fulfilling on this are mindful of those consequences.

A SALUTE TO THE APOLLO 12 ASTRONAUTS

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in contrast with all of the remarks that have been made in decrying war, and the costs of war, I would like to present a happier note, and announce to the House that which is already known, but so to make it part of the RECORD, that Apollo 12 has returned to earth. The astronauts are getting along very fine; they are still confined, and will be throughout the period during which they will be quarantined.

The preliminary indications of some of the data that they have acquired or initiated are of great interest to the scientific community and to the world.

I am sure that all Members join with me in congratulating these fine men, and in congratulating NASA for another well-done job.

PESTICIDE CONTAMINATION— TIME FOR ACTION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to give the Secretary of HEW the legal authority to ban or limit the use of pesticides whenever the use of such substance is hazardous to public health. The Secretary of Interior should have greater statutory authority to participate in decisions regarding pesticide compounds which constitute a danger to fish and wildlife and contaminate the environment.

The more that I learn about DDT and other persistent pesticides, the more ecologically dangerous to man and other forms of life they seem to be.

I strongly endorse Secretary Finch's acceptance of the Mrak-Secretary's Commission on Pesticides and their Relationship to Environmental Health—Commission's recommendation "to eliminate within 2 years all uses of DDT and DDD in the United States, excepting those uses essential to the preservation of human health or welfare." I am also in agreement with the Commission's recommendation to "restrict the usage of certain persistent pesticides in the United States to specific essential uses which create no known hazard to human health or to the quality of the environment and which are unanimously approved by the Secretaries of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Agriculture and Interior." The Commission found the pesticides, aldrin, dieldrin, endrin, heptachlor, chlordane, benzene hexachloride, lindane and compounds containing arsenic, lead, or mercury to be persistent, to cause contamination of the environment and to cause damage to various life forms.

The Commission further recommended that human exposure to those pesticides considered a potential health hazard to man be minimized. The Commission found that in recent screening studies in animals several pesticide compounds were judged to be "positive" for tumor induction. In similar screening studies other pesticide compounds were judged to be teratogenic—cause fetal deformities as in the case of the drug, thalidomide. As a result the Commission believed a need existed to reexamine the registered uses of the materials and other relevant data in order to take prudent action. The pesticide compounds so indicted were Aldrin; Amitrol; Aramite; Aradex; Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether; Chlorobenzilate; p, p'-DDT; Dieldrin; Heptachlor (epoxide); Mirex; N-(2-hydroxyethyl) hydrazine; Strobane; Captan; Carbaryl; the butyl, isopropyl and isooctyl esters of 2,4,-D; Folpet; mercurials; PCNB and 2,4,5-T. It is very possible that many of these pesticide compounds may be found as residues on our food crops. Consideration and thought should be given as to the benefit versus risk on the use of 2,4,5-T; 2,4,-D esters; and cacodylic acid as defoliants.

Although Secretary Finch endorsed the recommendations of the Commission he claims he has no authority to ban or limit the use, or to effect the labeling and registration of, these compounds.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now holds that the Delaney clause of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act—which provides that no additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal—does not apply to pesticide residues despite the aminotriazole—cranberry flap where it was invoked. HEW will act to seize food with high pesticide residue levels. This does not affect the use of the pesticides but merely permits removal of food products after they have been contaminated with a pesticide compound.

The authority to permit the marketing of a pesticide rests in the Secretary of

Agriculture under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. The Agriculture Department has consistently ignored the potential public health hazards and freely allowed the use of pesticide compounds dangerous to human health and other forms of life in its administration of the FIFRA Act.

This act provides that before pesticides can be sold in interstate commerce a manufacturer must register his product with the Department of Agriculture and attest to its safety and efficacy. The act gives the Department authority to enforce, revoke or limit such registration. Presently more than 60,000 pesticide formulations, involving more than 900 individual chemical compounds have been registered.

In 1963 the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee urged that greater authority be given to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in controlling the use of pesticides. As a result, an interdepartmental agreement was entered into by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Interior; and Agriculture. Under the agreement, data supplied by the manufacturers was supposed to be evaluated by the three departments prior to registration. Interior was to assess the effects of pesticides on wild birds, mammals and fish, and their habitat. HEW was to assess the effects the pesticides may have on the health of man. Agriculture had the responsibility of assessing the safety and effectiveness of the pesticides when used as directed on the label and registration. Did this agreement work—the answer is "No."

The House Government Operations Committee of which I am a member issued a report on November 17, 1969, entitled, "Deficiencies in Administration of Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act." The report pointed out the lack of interagency cooperation. HEW had objected to a total of 1,663 proposed registrations or reregistrations during a 5-year period from July 1, 1964, through June 30, 1969, but not one of the 1,663 HEW objections was referred to the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with provisions of the interdepartmental agreement. Annual meetings required by the agreement were not held. HEW officials had concluded that Agriculture had no intention of complying with the terms of the interdepartmental agreement. Interdepartmental meetings when held broke down on differences. Thus the committee concluded from hearings and inquiry:

The Department of Agriculture failed completely to carry out its responsibility to enforce provisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act intended to protect the public from hazardous and ineffective pesticide products being marketed in violation of the act.

Numerous pesticide products have been approved for registration over objections of HEW as to their safety without compliance with required procedures for resolving such safety questions.

The Department of Agriculture approved pesticide products for uses which it knew, or should have known, were practically certain to result in illegal adulteration of food.

The Pesticides Regulation Division,

Department of Agriculture, failed to take adequate precautions to insure that pesticide product labels approved for registration clearly warn users against possible hazards associated with such products.

Information available to Federal agencies concerning pesticide poisonings is inadequate and incomplete. The Department of Agriculture failed to make effective use of even the limited data available.

The Department of Agriculture did not take prompt or effective cancellation action in cases when it had reason to believe a registered pesticide product might be ineffective or potentially hazardous.

The Department of Agriculture consistently failed to take action to remove potentially hazardous products from marketing channels after cancellation of a pesticide registration or through suspension of a registration.

The Department of Agriculture has no procedures for warning purchasers of potentially hazardous pesticide products.

The Department of Agriculture failed to take appropriate precautions against appointment of consultants to positions in the pesticide area in which their duties might conflict with the financial interests of their private employer.

Accordingly, the House Government Operations Committee recommended drastic review and shakeup of the Department of Agriculture's pesticide operations. The Mrak Commission based on its own inquiry and fact gathering concluded that existing interagency agreement to be inoperable by advocating a new interagency agreement. Further, the Mrak Commission pointed out that the present Department of Agriculture practice under the Interagency Agreement requires the Secretaries of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of the Interior to produce scientific evidence clearly demonstrating a present hazard to health or to the environment in order to remove from registered use or prevent the registration of any specific pesticides. The Commission concluded that the burden of proof should rest upon the manufacturer to demonstrate to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that appropriate tests do not produce untoward effects upon two or more species of mammals which might indicate a hazard to health. The Commission felt the imposition of this duty was the intent of the act which it appears had been ignored by the Department of Agriculture. The Mrak Commission further stated:

If the objective of providing to the Secretary of DHEW the authority to meet his responsibility for control of health hazards of pesticides cannot be attained by a new Interagency Agreement, it will be necessary to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

Will a new interagency agreement work? If past experience is any guide, the probability is that it will not, especially if there is no legal authority in the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare and Interior and all the authority is vested in the Secretary of Agriculture. Under such circumstances any interagency agreement is useless since Agriculture may ignore it at will. In the past, for example, Health, Education, and

Welfare objected to registering a product that was a proven carcinogen—cancer producer—for laboratory animals but the Department of Agriculture told FDA, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that until FDA could produce evidence that this product produced cancers in human beings from skin contact, Agriculture would continue to register the product.

I submit that the prime priority in the registration or re-registration of the use of pesticide compounds should be the potential hazard to health rather than the benefit to food and fiber. There must be a balancing of benefits versus the risks, but the potential hazard to health cannot be totally ignored as the Department of Agriculture consistently has done.

The President's Environmental Council recently announced several steps to remedy some of the defects that I mentioned together with other constructive steps such as the banning of the use of DDT for all household and community uses, except in emergency cases and when no other alternative is available. The Environmental Quality Council has no statutory authority. The Secretary of Agriculture ordered the above ban on DDT and also a ban on all other DDT uses by December 21, 1970, except for emergency control of diseases and massive crop pest infestations. Further, that beginning in March 1970 the same action being applied to DDT also will be taken as to the other persistent pesticides.

I applaud the action whenever the end result is to protect the public health. I would urge the continued use of either DDT or those other persistent pesticides effective against termites or such uses where the benefit would not appear to create a potential risk on the environment or on human health. The Environmental Quality Council release declared that an agreement had been reached with the Department of Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare on joint responsibility for assessing the public health aspects of pesticides and further the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was delegated the power by the Secretary of Agriculture to veto the use of pesticides that might affect public health.

I favor such action if it is for real.

However, the same steps could have been taken under the past agreement. Whenever the Department of Agriculture chose to ignore the past agreement, it did so. There is no assurance that it might not do so again as the sole legislative authority still is vested in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Therefore, I intend to introduce legislation which will assure that this will not occur by granting to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare greater authority to participate in decisions regarding initial or continuing registration of pesticide compounds which present a potential health hazard.

CRACKING DOWN ON THE STOLEN CREDIT CARD RACKET

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New

York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am asking Congress to crack down on the organized credit card racket which costs \$100 million a year. I think it should be a Federal crime to fraudulently use a credit card.

Our present Federal laws cannot cope with stolen credit cards even though they are freely used interstate. This irony is due to the fact that the thief can only be charged with a misdemeanor since the intrinsic value of the card—perhaps a few cents—is no gage of its actual value. But the single credit card can well represent a potential theft of \$50,000, or even more, before its blacklisting can be caught up with or the thief apprehended.

My bill would make it a felony to transport, use, or sell any counterfeit, stolen, or otherwise fraudulently obtained or altered credit cards between States. The Federal penalty for such an offense would be up to \$10,000 or 10 years in prison. It also provides that merely transporting or using such a card shall be prima facie evidence of fraudulent intent. It would not only strike at the thieves, counterfeiters, and forgers, but also "fences" who trade in fake or stolen credit cards.

Fake or stolen credit cards also have great mobility. Credit card thieves are not bound by geography. Police are limited by State lines; crooks ignore them. For instance, local authorities estimate that the traffic in illegal credit cards flowing back and forth between Kennedy Airport in Queens and Los Angeles is now comparable in magnitude to stolen jewelry as a public menace.

The only Federal law that applies to organized rackets, the so-called Stolen Property Act—does not cover credit cards as such, because it applies only in instances of stolen merchandise valued over \$5,000. The result is, that of 1.5 million lost credit cards annually, over a third are stolen, costing the issuers and card owners \$100 million every year, according to reliable estimates.

With just as many credit cards in America now as people, the organized racket in stolen and forged credit cards is an ever mounting threat to the American economy. And with most American families averaging six credit cards, what with gasoline, department store, restaurant, and travel cards readily available today, the chances of the average family being victimized are very great.

Unfortunately, the card owner often must bear the financial loss when cards are lost or stolen. Most card issuers, that is, banks or gasoline firms, hold the card owner liable for any expenses charged after his card disappears until written notice is given. Police files indicate cases in which issuers recovered amounts of over \$2,000 from innocent defenseless card owners.

Credit cards are a useful convenience in our highly mobile American economy. They make it safer and easier to use credit with little disagreeable delay all over the United States and in other parts of the world. But these same cards, in the wrong hands, can be part of the arsenal of thieves and of organized crime.

The real injury done to the public is that a vast criminal underground is

being supported in part with stolen cards. The credit card has often become the wheels and wings of the gangland enforcer, the hired killer. It is a means by which underworld assassins can move swiftly and anonymously, with free airline tickets, leaving scarcely any trail for the law to follow.

Not too many years ago, when a purse snatcher or a pickpocket found credit cards in a stolen wallet or pocketbook, he promptly discarded them. Today, the credit cards are the cream of the stolen crop, because a black market and organized fencing operation have matched the growth of credit cards.

Law enforcers have told him that the theft of credit cards is a highly and skillfully organized racket. Numbers of parking lot attendants, hotel and motel maids, prostitutes, and store clerks have been enlisted in the nationwide racket. A lost or stolen credit card can mean hard cash in the organized black market.

Some examples of increased organized credit card racketeering include:

An investigation is presently underway by the Bronx, N.Y., district attorney concerning infiltration of local post offices by the underworld to divert unsolicited credit cards mailed in bulk by some banks.

Post Office officials report that last year 80 post office employees were arrested in various parts of the country and charged with theft of credit cards.

A counterfeiting ring operating out of New York has been arrested for selling American Express Cards throughout New England, amassing over \$170,000 in credit charges.

A Mafia group has been disclosed to have spent over \$350,000 for travel and living expenses with stolen cards from the Diners Club.

A huge network of fraudulent transactions was recently uncovered in Chicago involving a conspiracy of swindlers and service station dealers in which cards were sold to dealers who submitted false credit forms.

Police and public prosecutors have also told me of instances in which a single credit card has been used to rack up illicit purchases totaling from \$40,000 to \$75,000.

The amazing figures are understandable when you realize that the very nature of the credit card puts the thief far ahead in his race with the law. A card picked up in New York City can be used within a few hours in San Francisco, Paris, or Rome.

The retailer who honors the card may return his signed slips in a matter of weeks or even a month or more later. By that time, the fast-moving crook can cover a large piece of the globe, using airline tickets purchased fraudulently with the same stolen card.

It is easy to see why the yearly loss through credit card theft and fraud has been estimated at the staggering sum of \$100,000,000. It is also reasonable to conjecture that the true total of credit card losses may be far beyond that figure.

The issuer may consider the possibility of irritating a legitimate customer by mistake, because of the awkward methods of apprehension available under present law. He must balance that pos-

sibility against the possible losses. Frequently, he decides that he can afford to write off the loss to avoid the possible bad public relations involved in trying to take action against a suspected thief.

It is unfortunate in this case, as in others, that the forces of law have many more roadblocks in their path than the lawbreakers. A credit card thief has virtually no geographic limitations to his operations, but law-enforcement agencies—especially State and local law enforcers—have limitations of time, money, distance and State lines.

I must point out that in my own county of Queens, N.Y., with two of the busiest airports in the East, and Los Angeles, are the two coastal ends of the cross-continent airline route between which much of the stolen credit card traffic moves.

It is significant to note that New York State recently took the first step toward establishing a model State credit card law. A new law sponsored by State Senator John R. Dunne makes it a felony to steal or receive or unlawfully possess a credit card owned by another person. It also provides stiff penalties for forging, altering or counterfeiting credit cards.

But even such State action cannot be enough. There is a vital need to establish distinct Federal jurisdiction to help counteract the credit card crook's ability to move speedily and in comparative safety, without regard to State lines or areas of jurisdiction. Unfortunately, the most applicable Federal law is still drowsing in the horse-and-buggy era, as far as credit cards are concerned.

It is essential that we change the law to enable Federal law-enforcement agencies to use their full powers most effectively in tracking and catching the credit card racketeers.

THE HAYNSWORTH NOMINATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am disheartened and dismayed at the Senate's rejection of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, President Nixon's nominee to the Supreme Court.

Judge Haynsworth's critics claimed he failed to meet the high standards expected of Supreme Court Judges. However, the so-called high standards the critics employed to arrive at their conclusions were ones never before applied to Presidential nominees; and, in fact, were standards that the Senate has consistently refused to apply to its own Members. In a word, the standards were artificial.

The background and qualifications of Judge Haynsworth have been subjected to extensive congressional inquiry. By a 3-to-1 majority, the Senate Judiciary Committee concluded that the judge had not participated in any cases in which he had a real conflict of interest. During the committee investigation, Judge Haynsworth received the unequivocal endorsement of 16 past presidents of the American Bar Association. In addition, the well-respected ABA Committee on Judicial Selection made an inten-

sive examination of the judge and unanimously approved the nomination. In this connection, the committee reported that it was the "unvarying, unequivocal, and emphatic" opinion of "each judge and lawyer interviewed" that Judge Haynsworth possesses impeccable integrity. Finally, all of his fellow circuit judges, and all of the district judges in the fourth judicial district, which includes the States of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, publicly stated their confidence in and support of the judge.

Mr. Speaker, for anyone to suggest that these distinguished members of the legal profession were motivated by anything but a sincere regard for promoting high judicial standards would be slander of the worst sort.

Based on the record, I think it is obvious that the real opposition to Judge Haynsworth centered on his judicial philosophy. In my opinion, the judge was, in effect, rejected by the Senate because he fully discharged the responsibilities of his judgeship. By the uncontradicted reports of those who came in contact with him in a professional capacity, Judge Haynsworth did his job, and he did it well. He sat on cases on which he had the responsibility to sit. He rendered decisions as a fair-minded individual who believed in upholding the law and the Constitution. He followed the judicial precept that a judge should be responsible, that judicial decisions should be based on established legal principles and not on political moods of the moment.

By judicial standards, Clement F. Haynsworth is a conservative. He sees his judicial responsibilities in clear and simple terms. He considers himself charged with upholding the terms of the Constitution, and strictly enforcing the laws of the land. I agree with this philosophy, as does President Nixon.

During the course of the 1968 campaign, President Nixon promised to restore some semblance of balance to the Supreme Court, a Court that under the leadership of Justice Earl Warren has played havoc with American traditions for over 15 years. President Nixon began restructuring the Court by appointing Judge Warren E. Burger to succeed retiring Justice Warren as Chief Justice. He was continuing his efforts, efforts born of deep personal conviction, with the Haynsworth nomination.

That the confirmation of Judge Haynsworth was rejected is tragic for the Nation, the President, the Senate, and for Haynsworth himself. It is tragic for the Nation because the American people will be denied, even longer, full representation on the Supreme Court. In addition, the principles that the people voted for in voting for President Nixon will not be accorded their full weight in Supreme Court decisions. It is tragic for the President because he handpicked a candidate, and subjected him to exhaustive investigations by the FBI and the Justice Department, both of whom certified his qualifications for the nomination. The end result of these efforts was that his nominee was rejected by the Senate for political reasons. The Senate suffered by the affair and its prestige has been damaged because certain Senators let them-

selves be controlled by labor bosses and civil rights agitators who were unalterably opposed to the nomination. The most tragic casualty is, of course, the judge himself. He has rendered years of distinguished service to the bench and bar, and as a reward was pilloried by self-serving headline hunters and misguided liberals.

Mr. Speaker, the question that must be faced now is where do we go from here. A Presidential nominee has been rejected by the Senate because he failed to meet impossible and artificial standards. The President has declared he will employ the same constitutional standards in choosing his next nominee to the Court that he used in choosing Judge Haynsworth.

At this point in time, it seems that an impasse exists between the Senate and the President. I think the distance can be bridged, and rightly so, if the Senate adheres closer to its constitutional responsibilities, and votes for the next nominee strictly on the basis of his judicial qualifications for the post.

CRIME IN AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, recently testified before the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. The theme of his remarks was clear: Criminal violence has become the most serious domestic crisis now facing our Nation.

What made Director Hoover's comments particularly telling is the fact that he is one of the Nation's foremost experts on crime. He is in a position to know the true facts about crime, and the facts he related to the National Commission were alarming ones. According to FBI statistics, the United States is experiencing an epidemic of crime and violence unparalleled in the history of the world. No segment of society is safe from the menace of crime. Muggers, sex offenders, and mobsters prey on innocent citizens in ever-increasing numbers.

In an attempt to graphically depict the pattern and amount of crime in America at any given moment, the FBI has instituted "crime clocks" that show the frequency with which certain crimes occur. Last year, for example, violence occurred with the following frequency:

Serious crimes, seven each minute;
violent crimes, one each minute;
Murder, one every 43 minutes;
Forcible rape, one every 19 minutes;
Aggravated assault, one every 12 minutes;

Robbery, one every 2½ minutes;

Burglary, one every 20 seconds;

Larceny, one every 30 seconds; and

Auto theft, one every 48 seconds.

Statistics like these are staggering. What is even more staggering, however, is the speed at which the rate of crime and violence is rising. During the first 6 months of this year, crime in general rose 21 percent faster than it did last year. Murder and rape increased 21 percent faster during the first half of 1969, armed robbery increased 34 percent, and aggravated assaults were up 28 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the full story of crime in the United States is contained in Director Hoover's statement to the National Commission on the Causes and Preven-

tion of Violence. I commend the full text of Mr. Hoover's remarks to the attention of my colleagues. I believe his penetrating analysis of the problem of crime and violence, and the conclusions he recommends, deserve thoughtful consideration.

While dealing with this subject, I would like to take the opportunity to urge the Democratic leadership of the House Judiciary Committee to commence action on the many legislative proposals to fight crime that the Nixon administration has sent to the Congress. Contained in these many proposals are new ideas and new approaches that could effectively be employed to combat this growing menace to our Nation.

The material referred to follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 7, 1968]

THE STORY OF CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

(By J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director)

Violence is a reality in America today. In the light of events in recent years, it has become the most serious domestic problem confronting the United States.

CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

Every indicator available to the FBI, from its investigative responsibilities in both the criminal and security fields, emphasizes that violence is a rapidly growing malady. This is clearly shown in the statistics compiled by the FBI in its Uniform Crime Reporting program.

Of an estimated 3.75 million serious crimes reported to law-enforcement agencies in 1967, 484,900 were violent crimes in the classifications of murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault.

This represented a substantial increase over the 421,000 such crimes reported in 1966.

The violent-crime rate in the United States for 1967 reached 250 victims per 100,000 population. This is more than double the 1940 rate, 88 per cent higher than the 1950 rate, and 57 per cent above the 1960 rate.

Over all, crime in the United States rose 21 per cent during the first six months of 1968 over the corresponding period in 1967.

The violent crimes of murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault increased 21 per cent as a group. Armed robberies increased 34 per cent, and aggravated assaults with firearms 28 per cent in the first six months of 1968, as compared to the same period in 1967.

These statistics represent an epidemic of crime and violence which has affected virtually every segment of American society. The mugger, the rapist, the hoodlum stalk our streets in frightening numbers. Fear of venturing outside the home at night has become a fact of urban life.

Guns are far and away the most common weapons used in murders and nonnegligent homicides. Of the 12,090 murders reported in the United States in 1967, over 7,600 were committed with firearms. They were also used in over 73,000 armed robberies and over 52,000 aggravated assaults. It is significant in these times, when we know too well the tragic stories of senseless sniper killings and the shooting of innocent people by crazed gunmen, that murder by firearms has increased 47 per cent since 1964.

Armed robberies and aggravated assaults with firearms have increased 58 and 76 per cent, respectively, since 1964.

The "crime clocks," as contained in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports for 1967, show that last year these offenses occurred at these time rates:

Serious crimes: Seven each minute.

Violent crimes: One each minute.

Murder: One every 43 minutes.

Forcible rape: One every 19 minutes.

Aggravated assault: One every 2 minutes.

Robbery: One every 2½ minutes.

Burglary: One every 20 seconds.

Larceny: One every 30 seconds.

Auto theft: One every 48 seconds.

VIOLENCE AGAINST LAW-ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The violence of the criminal, often cold-blooded and calculated, is especially felt by law-enforcement officers.

In 1967, 76 officers were killed in the United States while performing their official duties. This raised the total of these deaths to 411 for the eight-year period beginning in 1960. In 96 per cent of these murders, firearms were used.

A study of the criminal histories of the 539 offenders involved in these police murders since 1960 reveals that 77 per cent had been arrested on some prior criminal charge before they took an officer's life. In fact, 54 per cent of those offenders with prior criminal arrests had been previously taken into custody for such violent crimes as murder, rape, robbery and assault with intent to kill.

Of the offenders previously convicted, two thirds had been granted leniency in the form of parole or probation. Three of every 10 of the offenders were on parole or probation when they murdered an officer.

Physical assaults against officers are also increasing. A heavy toll of injuries among police officers has resulted from enforcement action taken in connection with riots and civil disobedience.

Nationally, the rate of assaults on law-enforcement officers in 1967 was up 11 per cent, and assaults per 100 officers increased to 13.5 per cent from 12.2 per cent in 1966.

YOUTHFUL CRIMINALITY

A particularly tragic facet of the crime and violence problem in this country is the increasing involvement of young people.

A disproportionate share of national crime is committed by persons under 18 years of age. In 1967, for example, 49 per cent of those arrested for serious crimes were in this age bracket; and arrests of persons under 18 increased a startling 69 per cent from 1960 to 1967, while the number of persons in the age group 10 through 17 increased just 22 per cent.

The majority of juvenile crimes are against property—62 per cent of all persons arrested for car theft in 1967, for example, were under 18 years of age. However, youthful violence has been steadily rising. Arrests of individuals in this age group for violent crimes showed the following percentage increases in 1967 over 1960: murder, 56 per cent; forcible rape, 38 per cent; robbery, 96 per cent, and aggravated assault, 121 per cent.

Violence is particularly prevalent today among young people in large metropolitan areas. Vicious juvenile gangs terrorize the slum sections which spawn them, using weapons easily made or come by to commit crimes of violence, which all too frequently leave their victims killed or maimed. This youthful criminality too often establishes a career in crime.

ORGANIZED CRIME

Although violence is an integral part of the operations of organized crime—whose major syndicate is known as La Cosa Nostra—it is a coldly calculated tactic to maintain the group's dominance over its own members and over the members of the society in which it operates, rather than terror for terror's sake.

The peculiar evil of this type of "corporate" violence is not the individual sadism and brutality of the "enforcers" and "strong-arm men," but the monopolistic position it enables racket leaders to gain and hold in their legitimate, as well as their illicit, activities.

Force and threats of force are employed to eliminate rivals, collect on gambling and loan-sharking debts, frighten potential witnesses, enforce internal discipline, and gain

possession of various business chattels. In the greater Chicago area alone, there have been more than 1,000 gangland slayings since 1919, only 17 of which have been solved; in the greater Boston area, there have been more than 50 during the past four years, only 11 of which have been solved.

CAREERS IN CRIME

The FBI's careers-in-crime program, a study of criminal careers, made possible by the co-operative exchange of criminal-fingerprint data among law-enforcement agencies, has produced the following profile of 12,026 perpetrators of violent crimes who were arrested in 1966 and 1967:

For the murderers, of whom there were 922, the average criminal career was 11 years, and 7 arrests. For the felonious-assault offenders, of whom there were 4,538, the average career was 10 years, and 8 arrests. For the rapists, of whom there were 925, the average career was 8 years, and 7 arrests. And for the robbers, of whom there were 5,641, the average career was 9 years, with 8 arrests.

Seven per cent of the murderers had previously been charged with homicide during their criminal careers, and 18 per cent of the rapists were repeaters of this violation. With respect to the felonious-assault offenders, 30 per cent had previous arrests for serious assaults, and 37 per cent of the robbers had repeated that crime. This is of key interest, because it shows a tendency toward the commission of violent crimes by repeaters.

COST OF CRIME AND VIOLENCE

The enormous cost in money and ruined lives, which the statistics of American crime represent, touches almost every citizen in some manner. The cost in dollars and cents is staggering—estimated at over 27 billion dollars a year.

The damage inflicted by the riots in our cities in recent years has added materially to this figure. The rioting here in Washington, D.C., following the murder of Martin Luther King on April 4, 1968, caused damage estimated at 24 million dollars. Losses sustained during the April rioting in Baltimore amounted to 14 million dollars.

The cost to society of the fear and anguish resulting from violence cannot be assessed monetarily. There is no way to determine accurately the damage to the nation or to individual lives resulting from the harrowing experiences of criminal attacks which maim or mutilate, nor the price of personal grief and suffering for families of those struck down by killers. The corrosion of fear which violence brings saps our strength as a nation and weakens the social fabric of our communities.

ORGANIZATIONS ADVOCATING VIOLENCE

There are in the United States today a number of subversive and extremist organizations which advocate force and violence. They strive in every possible way to disrupt law and order, and to inculcate hatred and bigotry that breed violence.

Communist Party, U.S.A.

Prominent among these is the Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA). Communist statements for public consumption to the contrary, material furnished for study within the CPUSA clearly reveals that the use of force and violence is—as it has always been—the primary technique for the Communist seizure of power.

Communists are in the forefront of civil-rights, antiwar and student demonstrations, many of which ultimately become disorderly and erupt into violence. As an example, Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil, 24-year-old member of the CPUSA's National Committee, was a leading organizer of "free speech" demonstrations on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley in the fall of 1964. There, protests, culminating in the arrest of more than 800 demonstrators during a massive campus sit-in on Dec. 3, 1964, were the forerunner of the current campus upheaval.

In a press conference on July 4, 1968, the opening day of the CPUSA's special National Convention, Gus Hall, the party's General Secretary, stated that there were Communists on most of the major college campuses in the country, and that they had been involved in the student protests.

Mike Zagarell, CPUSA youth leader, claimed that the party had played a leading role in student rebellions and antidraft demonstrations across the country during the past year. For example, he claimed that 60 of the 300 marshals used during "Stop the Draft Week" demonstrations in New York City during December, 1967, were CPUSA members.

These statements are amply supported by the evidence of such Communist participation in student unrest and antidraft protest demonstrations which FBI investigations have disclosed.

The Students for a Democratic Society, for example, has played a key role in many of these demonstrations, and some of its members, as well as some of its national leaders, have publicly admitted that they were Communists. In addition, members of the CPUSA-controlled W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America and other Communist splinter youth groups, such as the Young Socialist Alliance, the Youth Against War and Fascism, and the Progressive Labor Party, have been very active in these demonstrations.

Communists labor ceaselessly to exploit the racial situation and to incite racial strife and violence in this country. They have been active in exploiting propagandistically the riots of recent years. One main Communist goal is to alienate Negroes from established authority.

It has long been Communist policy to charge and protest "police brutality" wherever possible—particularly in racial situations—in a calculated effort to discredit law enforcement and to accentuate racial issues. The cumulative effect of this continuing smear campaign proves that it has been immensely successful. This campaign popularized the cry of "police brutality" to the point where it has, unfortunately, been accepted by many non-Communists, especially militants among minority groups and students.

The net effect of the charge of "police brutality" is to provoke and encourage mob action and violence by developing contempt for constituted authority.

Other Communist organizations

Other Communist organizations in this country dedicated to the use of force and violence include the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and the pro-Red Chinese Progressive Labor Party (PLP). The activities of William Epton, Negro vice president of the PLP, in connection with the 1964 Harlem riot resulted in his arrest by New York authorities. He was subsequently found guilty of conspiracy to riot, advocacy of criminal anarchy, and conspiracy to advocate criminal anarchy.

Students for a Democratic Society

The emergence of the so-called "New Left" movement in this country in recent years has attracted much public attention because of its flagrant resort to civil disobedience.

The New Left is composed of radicals, anarchists, pacifists, crusaders, socialists, Communists, idealists and malcontents. It is predominantly a campus-oriented movement. A large proportion of the New Leftists was reared in affluent homes.

This movement, which is best typified by its primary component, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), has an almost passionate desire to destroy the traditional values of our democratic society and the existing social order. The SDS has been described by Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CPUSA, as part of the "responsible left" which the Communist Party has "going for us."

In recent months, student disturbances have exploded on college and university campuses throughout the United States, initiated by student activists, many of whom are affiliated with the SDS or campus-based black-extremist groups. The riotous activity at Columbia University was spearheaded by Mark Rudd, chairman of the SDS chapter at this university. In an open letter to President Kirk [of Columbia University], which appeared in the public press in May, 1968, Rudd stated, "Your power is directly threatened, since we will have to destroy that power before we take over."

The SDS held a national convention at Michigan State University in June, 1968. At this convention, methods to disrupt Selective Service facilities and law enforcement were discussed in a "sabotage and explosives" workshop. Suggestions included: flushing bombs in toilets to destroy plumbing, using sharp, tripod-shaped metal instruments to halt vehicles; firing Molotov cocktails from shotguns; jamming radio equipment, and dropping "thermite bombs" down manholes to destroy communications systems.

The protest activity of the New Left and the SDS, under the guise of legitimate expression of dissent, has created an insurrectionary climate which has conditioned a number of young Americans—especially college students—to resort to civil disobedience and violence.

Because activists of the New Left are committed to the use of direct action and violence to achieve their objectives, the New Left movement is becoming more and more anarchistic, militant and violent. As an example, a June, 1968, issue of "The Rat," a New Left underground newspaper published in New York City, carried an article and diagram describing the manufacture of a homemade bomb out of ammonium nitrate and a length of pipe. This particular article concluded by noting that a subsequent issue would contain plans for making thermite bombs.

White hate organizations

In addition to Communist and New Left groups, there are a number of organizations which are basically terrorist and hoodlum by nature. These groups are chiefly of a hate or "anti" variety—anti-Negro, antiwhite, anti-Semitic, or anti-minority.

Their common denominator is a distrust for law and order, and a belief in force and violence.

White hate groups include more than a dozen Klan organizations, lineal descendants of the Ku Klux Klan, which was founded over a century ago. The Klan has a tradition of and a penchant for violence. Over the years, murder, arson, bombings and beatings of Negroes have been perpetrated in many areas by Klansmen.

The National States' Rights Party is a white hate group which is composed of former members of Klan organizations, as well as notorious anti-Semites. It, too, has consistently and pointedly advocated a policy of violence.

The National Socialist White People's Party, formerly known as the American Nazi Party, is another organization that espouses a line of hatred against Negroes and Jews.

The Minutemen is a group of "superpatriots" who ostensibly are preparing and training to engage in guerrilla warfare in the United States following a Communist take-over, which they believe is inevitable. Its members have an obsession for weapons of all kinds.

Black-nationalist organizations

The whole problem of violence in American society has been intensified by the recent black-extremist organizations. These organizations contain many vicious hate-filled individuals whose objective is anarchy; whose symbol is the Molotov cocktail; whose slogan of defiance is "burn, baby, burn"; whose manifesto is Frantz

Fanon's "The Wretched of the Earth"; and whose preachers of the gospel of hate include Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown, and Robert Franklin Williams.

The Nation of Islam, the largest of these Negro hate organizations, is in both the extremist and the nonextremist camp. It has achieved a respectability of sorts because it has shrewdly used the shield of religion, and has insisted that its members avoid racial disorders and live moderately. Nevertheless, its meetings are replete with condemnations of the white race and vague references to the physical retribution that will be meted out to oppressors.

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), whose militant top leaders have included Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown, is one of the most publicized of the black-extremist groups. Carmichael, who was recently expelled from SNCC, has stated that black power signifies "bringing this country to its knees" and "using any force necessary" to attain objectives. He has also urged the blacks in this country to "prepare for a bloody revolution."

The impact of extremist spokesmen on the black community and their ability to incite the youth, in particular, cannot be underestimated. These spokesmen are extremely vocal and dedicated to the destruction of the United States. They have a large audience because of the widespread dissemination given to their inflammatory statements by the news media.

Consider the following statements: Carmichael said in Algiers in September, 1967, "Revolution is the only solution for the American Negroes." In August, 1968, he asserted that the black revolution is entering "the period of armed struggle" just before there is guerrilla warfare. Last summer in Cambridge, Md., H. Rap Brown reportedly said, "It's time for Cambridge to explode. Black folks built America. If America don't come around, we're going to burn it."

Earlier this year, Brown wrote, "We must move from resistance to aggression, from revolt to revolution. . . . May the deaths of '68 signal the beginning of the end of this country."

Take the violence in Cleveland, Ohio, in late July, 1968. There, members of the militant black-nationalist group New Libya exchanged gunfire with police, resulting in the deaths of three officers and eight civilians.

Representatives from several Negro universities and colleges attended a black-student conference sponsored by the SNCC and held in mid-April, 1968, in a Southern State. Reportedly, the majority of the men and women at this conference were armed with pistols.

Among the items discussed at a "defense workshop" at this conference were the following: preparation of maps showing the locations of the homes of mayors, chiefs of police, and similar authorities, so they can be eliminated by Mau Mau-type tactics; distribution of forces in several sections of a city to prevent law-enforcement agencies from concentrating in one area; location of snipers along travel routes of National Guard units and police forces; use of Vietnam war veterans to train black people in demolition, use of booby traps, location of vulnerable spots of armored vehicles, and guerrilla warfare; and use of black college students to instruct black people in adjacent communities in the care and use of firearms, preparation of Molotov cocktails, and reloading of spent cartridges.

The Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) is a militant, black-extremist, pro-Chinese Communist organization dedicated to the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. RAM has organized rifle clubs in order to engage in firearms practice and to obtain arms and ammunition.

On June 15, 1968, two RAM members were convicted in New York City of conspiring to murder Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young, Jr., two moderate Negro civil-rights leaders.

The Black Panther Party is an organization which advocates the use of guerrilla tactics and guns to end the oppression of the black race and the drafting of Negroes to fight in Vietnam.

On May 2, 1967, 24 members of this group invaded the California State assembly at Sacramento while it was in session. The invaders were armed with rifles, shotguns and pistols, and claimed they were there to protest a gun-registration law. On two occasions during October, 1967, and April 1968, members of this group engaged in gun battles with the police, resulting in the murder of one policeman, as well as the death of one group member and the wounding of another.

Within the past year, there have been sufficient contacts between militant black nationalists and representatives of unfriendly or hostile countries to indicate a degree of foreign involvement, participation and influence in the activities of black extremists in the United States. These foreign contacts serve to increase the potential for violence by giving inspiration, encouragement and support to the revolutionary aims, doctrines and activities of black extremists in this country.

Stockpiling of arms by black nationalists

Reports of the stockpiling of firearms and other weapons by black-nationalist groups are of great concern to the FBI and law enforcement. Such stockpiling is, of course, a distinct possibility in view of the ease with which firearms can be obtained in this country, and in the light of the inflammatory urgings of such agitators as Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown, and James Forman, director of international relations for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

At a meeting of black nationalists in Los Angeles in February, 1968, for instance, Forman told the audience that every Negro should be armed for the eventual revolution of the black people. Brown quoted from Mao Tse-tung that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." He added that Negroes should acquire guns because America only understands force. Carmichael exclaimed that all blacks must unite militarily.

FBI investigations of black extremists have uncovered innumerable allegations that these individuals have obtained firearms and are encouraging residents of ghetto areas to procure weapons. The incidents I previously mentioned in California and Ohio are graphic examples that this is being done. Black extremists have also distributed newspapers and leaflets describing methods of making firebombs for use in riots. "The Inner City Voice," a newspaper in Detroit, with a claimed circulation of 10,000 aimed at the ghetto reader, has published such information.

CAUSES OF AND REMEDIES FOR VIOLENCE

The crime and violence that flourish in America cannot be attributed to a single cause. The causes are many and interrelated, for they are rooted in a number of conditions and influences in contemporary life.

Just as there is no one cause, there is no single remedy. Crime and violence cannot be prevented or reduced by concentrating on one or two phases of the problem to the exclusion of the others. A co-ordinated and many-sided effort is required if effective results are to be achieved.

Social and economic

There are a number of vital social and economic factors—such as poverty, inequality of employment opportunities, inferior housing, inadequate education, discrimination, and breakdown of the family—which breed lawlessness and violence. I shall not dwell on them. It is sufficient to say that we must find ways to eliminate the conditions which are causing us so much grief and concern.

Social and economic causes aside, there are other important factors which have a strong bearing on the era of violence we live in. It is my firm conviction that crime and violence are increasing primarily because there is a

mass deterioration in the respect shown for the rule of law in our nation and for some who enforce it. In addition, the deterrents to crime have been weakened. Those who choose to break the law or commit acts of violence know that the punishment no longer fits the crime. This mass deterioration is also clearly manifested in the abdication of individual responsibility.

Individual responsibility

Too many individuals eagerly avail themselves of the rights, privileges, opportunities and benefits which this nation affords, but shirk the duties and responsibilities that life in a free society entails. Often, the serious problems and issues that face the nation can be laid directly to the failure of citizens to fulfill their personal and civic obligations.

There is, unfortunately, a reluctance on the part of some of our citizens to act positively in behalf of law and order. Police have been assaulted while spectators stood by idly watching. Crimes have gone unreported. Witnesses have been unwilling to testify. Even jury duty, the ultimate participation of the layman in the judicial process that seeks to protect him and his property, is regarded as something to be avoided if at all possible. This attitude of noninvolvement was tragically illustrated in the slaying of a young woman in New York City while at least 37 persons in the neighborhood witnessed the series of attacks on her lasting over an hour but did not go to her aid. In fact, only one witness went so far as to call the police.

The key ingredient of our nation's social structure is the individual. Each one must realize that in today's complex society he is, in fact, his brother's keeper. He must abide by the golden rule of treating others as he wishes others to treat him. The individual must realize that, as a member of society, he is dependent upon other members of the society. The individual must recognize that the more he contributes to society, the better society will become.

If each individual citizen would exert an extra measure of caution in his daily life in an effort to preclude opportunities for crime and criminals to flourish, the results in the prevention of crime and violence would be immeasurable. Automobile thefts provide a good example. FBI statistics reveal that in 42 per cent of the cars stolen in the United States, the key was left in the ignition, or the ignition was not locked.

Respect for law and authority

The results of the flagrant disregard for law and order are evident in the widespread and purposeful violation of laws and regulations not to one's personal liking. Such a disregard is not limited to those accused or convicted of crimes, and not to any particular group or groups of individuals in our society. Efforts to avoid payment of taxes, attempts to influence police officers in even minor traffic violations, and opposition to loyalty and patriotism as being old-fashioned and out of date are only a few examples of activities and ideas that undermine our system of law and order.

Heightening the atmosphere of resentment of authority and irresponsibility to others in our society is an all-too-prevalent defiance of duly established laws and rules that is euphemistically termed "civil disobedience." It takes the form of draft-card burnings, seizure of property, or loud and disruptive demonstrations.

The demagogic exhortations of a number of civil-rights, peace, and student leaders have done much to encourage and condone lawlessness and civil disobedience. Their unsound doctrine implies that the answers to all social and economic problems are not to be found in legal procedures, but on the streets, behind barricades, and even in looting, shooting, arson and riots.

Lawlessness is not to be equated with legitimate dissent. Dissent is one of this nation's priceless values. It must be pro-

tected at all times and in all areas of thought and action, be it in time of peace or in time of war. But this dissent, of its very nature, requires law for both its expression and its preservation.

The attitude of the public and young people, particularly with regard to the resentment of authority and violence against the Government and other institutions, is not confined to the United States. A number of countries in other parts of the world, such as France and West Germany, have experienced the same attitude of revolt against established authority.

Attitude of permissiveness

An attitude of permissiveness is becoming more and more evident in our society today, leading to the progressive relaxing and discarding of all forms of restraint and discipline. This attitude has actually been fostered and, in effect, promoted by too many educators, sociologists, clergymen, public officials and parents. Its effect can be seen in the recent actions of some young people throughout the nation, with little or no respect being given for tradition or authority. Their actions have been undisciplined and unrestrained.

The abrogation of responsibility on the part of those in authority has developed among young people an "anything goes" attitude in personal and collective moral standards, and has resulted in an alarming breakdown of the moral fabric of American society.

Our increasing affluent, materialistic, and permissive society has encouraged the growth of a psychology of lawlessness and violence. There exist a softness and tolerance toward those who violate laws on the flimsy pretext of "conscience" or personal judgment of the "justness" of some laws. Such permissiveness invites further violation and leads directly to a general disregard for law and order.

Public officials themselves have played a part in the buildup of permissiveness and violence because of their tendency to overlook a little "lawbreaking" by pressure groups, apparently in the hope that this is the way to satisfy the demand and blunt it. Condoning acts of civil disorder makes law enforcement even more difficult. Moreover, capitulation to the perpetrators of violence merely leads to more leniency, more breaking of the law, and more violence.

Discrediting law enforcement

Much of the disrespect for law enforcement has grown up over the years from a general contempt for authority that has evolved in a permissive atmosphere. Attempts are made to depict law-enforcement officers in an unflattering manner or to improperly charge them with misconduct. Such claims tend to create a false image of law enforcement and to give license to those who consider the police as "enemies." Certainly, there is room for improvement in police personnel and operations, and there are instances of police misconduct. However, it is unfair to condemn all of law enforcement for the shortcomings of a few.

An acute problem facing law-enforcement agencies today is the failure to obtain an adequate number of qualified personnel. More trained police officers are urgently needed. The number of trained police officers—local, State and federal—has not kept pace, proportionately, with the increase in crime and violence in the United States.

There are several reasons for this lack of interested applicants: The most obvious reason is the traditionally low salaries paid to law-enforcement personnel. A police officer is expected to have some of the attributes of a sociologist, a criminologist and a lawyer, but is often paid less than an unskilled laborer.

Another factor which creates difficulties for recruiting law-enforcement personnel is

a trend away from holding this vocation in high esteem. Every effort should be made by individuals and organizations to attempt to raise the reputation of law enforcement, in order to make this vocation more popular in the eyes of our youth.

Adequate training of law-enforcement personnel is another remedy which will assist in creating a more professional corps among law officers. Police need instruction in the use of new equipment, developed for use in crime detection and prevention. Education in legal matters, such as recent court decisions affecting police work, is necessary for new officers, as well as older members of a police force.

To implement a program along this line, the FBI has long furnished instructors and conducted police schools throughout the United States in co-operation with local police agencies. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 authorized the FBI to assist in conducting local and regional training programs for State and local law-enforcement personnel when requested to do so by a State or unit of local government, and Congress has appropriated 3 million dollars for this purpose.

The FBI's training assistance will be materially increased with the construction of our new academy complex at Quantico, Va., a facility that will permit us to train approximately 3,000 police officers annually.

An extremely valuable weapon for combating all types of criminal activity, including violent crime, is the FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC), a computerized index concerning crime and criminals of nationwide interest. The NCIC provides law enforcement with immediately available centralized data pertaining to the instruments of violent crime—such as stolen firearms—and information on violence-prone offenders wanted by local, State and federal jurisdictions.

This system has been very successful not only in identifying stolen firearms in the hands of the criminal element, but also has been of immeasurable aid in removing the repeating offender from society. Police are finding the NCIC of great help in their work, which is attested by the fact that they are using this system over 20,000 times each day at present, and this use is constantly increasing.

Administration of justice

One very important aspect of the atmosphere of increased crime and violence is the administration of justice for the accused and convicted person. Today, prompt justice is thwarted many times by "continuance experts," by perennial browbeaters of witnesses, and by hunters for loopholes and technicalities in the law.

Many citizens, noting that even admitted criminals are being freed on procedural matters and not on the basis of guilt or innocence, are beginning to believe that some judges often seek to find errors rather than truth, thus tipping the scales in favor of the criminal over the rights of society. In addition, to see offenders "get away" with their criminal depredations certainly encourages certain other citizens to commit similar violations.

Some jurisdictions have reputations among the criminal element for "easy" treatment, on the specious ground that society and not the individual is responsible for criminal behavior. It can be said with some certainty, of course, that criminals learn quickly where sentencing is lenient.

Crime "repeaters" add to the threat facing the law-abiding citizen's person and property. I have said often that parole, probation and other clemency have their place in our system of criminal justice. What I strongly object to, however, is the inadequacy of such release measures to protect society when they are improperly implemented or administered.

An FBI program started in 1963 to follow

criminal and prosecutive histories has shown that of nearly 18,000 federal offenders released to the street in 1963, 60 per cent were arrested for new crimes within four years, and over 50 per cent were arrested in another State. In addition, of the 87,600 repeaters re-arrested in 1966 and 1967, over 55 per cent had received leniency in the form of parole, probation, suspended sentences or conditional releases.

If our system of law is to survive, then the law must be enforced. Those who break the law, acting alone or in concert, must be speedily detected and arrested, promptly prosecuted, and given proper, substantial punishment. The mollycoddling of vicious juveniles and the release of persons with criminal records without bond only encourages contempt for the law, for it permits such individuals to go out and flout the law again. Moreover, respect for the law is not increased by lenient judges, timid prosecutors and misguided writers.

Justice must extend beyond the courtroom back to the site where the victim's rights are violated. When the individual is no longer reasonably secure in his home and on the streets of his community, then justice is not served. Rather, the criminal is being favored at the expense of the law-abiding citizen. We need justice which keeps the balance true, and affords the law-abiding public an even break.

Firearms

United States citizens possess untold millions of pistols, rifles and shotguns. The ease with which firearms may be procured in the United States is a significant factor in the growth of crime and violence. Firearms have been readily obtainable through mail-order houses and across the counter for both the honest citizen and criminally inclined persons.

Thefts of firearms are still another source of weapons that are used in crime. An increase in such thefts from homes, sporting-goods stores, and Government facilities has been noted. As of Sept. 1, 1968, some 171,856 firearms of all types were listed as stolen, missing or recovered in the FBI's National Crime Information Center. These weapons, reported stolen since January, 1967, have been listed through facilities in only 43 States, as our center is still in the process of expanding to include all States.

The mounting number of violent crimes committed with firearms, and the tragic events of the last few months are mute testimony to the urgent need for more stringent and more effective gun controls to help prevent further violence. A recent national poll indicates that 81 per cent of the American people are in favor of stricter gun control.

I will reiterate my long-standing position that tough, comprehensive, uniform gun-control legislation is imperative for the public's safety. Although the passage of laws containing restrictions of weapons and the licensing of their owners would be somewhat of a chore, there can be no valid objection, since automobiles, airplanes, motorcycles, motor boats, and even dogs have long been subject to registration and/or licensing. The benefits to the safety and welfare of all our citizens would tremendously outweigh any disadvantages or inconveniences.

While gun controls obviously cannot end violence, rigidly enforced controls would undoubtedly contribute to a reduction in violence. The gun-control provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act recently enacted by Congress are a step in the right direction; however, it is imperative that further consideration be given to this pressing problem.

Communications media

Entertainment and communications media exert a strong influence upon our national tastes, standards and even our patterns of

conduct. Television, which reaches not only into the living room, but also into the nursery and playroom as well, has been a powerful force in the lives of our youth.

Although the television industry has control over the programs it presents, the extent of violence depicted in many shows is almost unbelievable. Viewers are constantly bombarded with a steady stream of sex, sadism and criminal acts that, through repetition, might appear to some as normal behavior.

Far too much emphasis is also being paid on television to the antics of a publicity-seeking extremist minority. Impressionable youths and immature individuals can easily conclude from television news coverage that everyone is protesting, demonstrating, marching and burning draft cards, when, in some cases, the reporters, camera men and assorted technicians appear to outnumber the demonstrators. Usually, rational explanations or refutations are not supplied.

I am in complete agreement with the observations of some representatives of the mass media who admit that television, radio and the press all too frequently are guilty of distorting the efforts of police to preserve law and order when confronted by large, hostile mobs, as was true in Chicago during the recent Democratic National Convention. These media will highlight and magnify some acts of so-called "police brutality" and completely ignore or minimize the premeditated and viciously provocative acts of demonstrators.

Professional demagogues, extremists and revolutionaries have learned that the news media—television in particular—are their most effective weapon to gain notoriety and to discredit law enforcement. Consequently, they make it a practice, for the benefit of television cameras, to try to goad police into resorting to strong measures necessary to maintain effective control.

Months before the Democratic National Convention was held authorities were fully aware that it was the target for disruption and violence on the part of dissident groups and individuals from all over the country. It was clear that these dissidents intended to deliberately force a direct hostile confrontation with established authority. Pre-Convention plans went so far as to involve assassination plots against Vice President Humphrey, Senator McCarthy and some prominent Negroes. It was against this background that authorities were compelled to

devise necessary and effective security precautions.

During the course of the Convention, demonstrators taunted the police and subjected them to unbelievable abuse. Demonstrators called them "pigs" and shouted obscenities at them, spit at them, threw bags of excrement and urine—and dangerous objects such as golf balls with protruding nails—at them. Unruly and menacing mobs gathered, intent on marching to the International Amphitheater and disrupting the Convention. It is true that some innocent people were the victims of unnecessary roughness on the part of the police; it is also true that the Chicago police and the National Guard were faced with vicious attacking mobs who gave them no alternative but to use force to prevent these mobs from accomplishing their destructive purposes. It is a tribute to the authorities that under these chaotic circumstances—deliberately created by ruthless, lawless leaders—the Convention was not disrupted, the city was not paralyzed, not one shot was fired by police at the demonstrators, and not one life was lost.

A seemingly limitless excess of sex, sadism, degeneracy and violence is only too apparent in the offerings of the motion-picture industry. One needs only to scan the lurid advertisements of current or coming film attractions. In some cases, these movies are labeled for adults only. However, the judgment as to just who is an adult is confined for the most part to the ticket salesman or the theater manager. A recent national survey concludes that 62 percent of those polled feel that "movies with violence in them" are major contributors to violence.

Cheap novels and sensual magazines which glorify sex, in both its normal and abnormal context, and mock our traditional standards of morality are becoming increasingly prevalent on the shelves of newsstands and book stores.

I have over the years publicly opposed any form of entertainment that glorifies violence, glamorizes corruption, and depicts criminals as heroes. No standard of decency can tolerate the portrayal of gangsters as modern-day Robin Hoods, concede that crime pays, ridicule decency and honesty, or justify the conclusion that graft and corruption are to be expected in our society.

Properly and intelligently prepared motion pictures and television programs emphasizing that crime is evil and brings misery, despair and even death can serve as a deterrent to

the would-be criminal. Such presentations, however, should be restrained, conform to rigid standards of good taste, authenticity and the portrayal of lawlessness in its proper light. The sound adage that crime does not pay should be inherent in them.

Extremism in all of the mass media should be avoided. Certainly, prompt, factual and objective reporting of violent actions, such as riots, is desirable and necessary so the public will be informed. However, overemphasis on the frenzied actions and statements of publicity-seeking extremists and hate-mongers can only beget violence.

The exhortation "burn baby, burn" by militant agitators on a television screen is definitely not conducive to quelling a riot.

As I have said in the past, strict adherence to high journalistic principles is a valuable and essential public service in matters affecting public safety.

CONCLUSION

The foundation of our society is a respect for and an observance of law and order. The mounting volume of crime and violence cannot be condoned or tolerated. The United States cannot have its citizens afraid to walk the streets of its cities, lest they be mugged or beaten or even killed. It cannot allow its public leaders to face constantly the risk of being assassinated.

There is no way, of course, that crime and violence can be completely eliminated. We will continue to have crime and violence in this country and throughout the world, because, unfortunately, criminal and violent behavior is the nature of some men. The answer will be found not in handwringing or self-indictment, but in striving to eradicate the basic sources of crime and violence through direct, positive measures—such as I have outlined—in order to reduce lawlessness to a minimum.

In conclusion, while there is a vital necessity for creating a wholesome social and economic atmosphere in which all citizens will have an equal opportunity to better themselves, we must not lose sight of time-proven deterrents to crime and violence. These deterrents—the certainty of sure detection, swift apprehension, and realistic treatment under law—are indispensable weapons in the never-ending battle to preserve law and order and decency. We need to make respect for law and order the first priority in our national life, for the rule of law is paramount to this nation's continued existence.

SERIOUS CRIMES IN THE UNITED STATES—YEAR-BY-YEAR RISE IN CRIMES AGAINST PEOPLE AND PROPERTY

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968 ¹
Total.....	2,014,600	2,082,400	2,213,600	2,435,900	2,755,000	2,930,200	3,264,200	3,802,300	4,589,000
Murders.....	9,000	8,600	8,400	8,500	9,300	9,900	10,900	12,100	14,200
Forcible rapes.....	16,900	16,900	17,200	17,300	21,000	23,000	25,300	27,100	31,300
Robberies.....	107,400	106,200	110,400	116,000	129,800	138,100	157,300	202,100	261,500
Aggravated assaults.....	152,000	154,400	162,100	171,600	200,000	212,100	231,800	253,300	290,000
Burglaries.....	897,400	934,200	978,200	1,068,800	1,193,600	1,261,800	1,387,200	1,605,700	1,885,000
Larcenies of \$50 or over.....	506,200	528,500	573,100	648,500	732,000	792,300	894,600	1,047,100	1,292,000
Auto thefts.....	325,700	333,500	364,100	405,200	469,300	493,100	557,000	654,900	815,000

¹ Annual rate, based on crimes reported in first 6 months.

Source: Federal Bureau of Investigation. Copyright © 1968, U.S. News & World Report, Inc.

HEMISFAIR '68

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, history has been made in the Southwest with the successful first world's fair south of St. Louis in the history of our country. I speak of HemisFair '68, a special cate-

gory world's fair authorized by the Bureau of International Expositions for 1968 in San Antonio; the same type of world's fair as the Seattle 1962 and Montreal 1967. Yes, it was more than a first in several ways. It was the first and only fair which received the sanction and appropriation by the Congress for preliminary planning to see if Federal participation was feasible. No other fair in

the history of our country received this kind of approval by the Congress.

It is for this reason that I have at all times reported back to the Congress. Today, I wish to round out the series of reports I have made in this House by inserting at this point in the RECORD a report compiled by the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce entitled "Economic Benefits From HemisFair '68."

But first, let me point out that never in the long history of San Antonio have we experienced the solid community support and the "togetherness" that HemisFair '68 elicited. Oh, yes, we had some dissenters, some obstructionists, some doubters, some skeptics, but they were all but drowned out by the unanimous voice of the overwhelming and preponderant number of citizens who wanted the fair. Oh, yes, we have some of these Miniver Cheevys, even now, in hindsight, sounding doleful noises, saying that the fair was not worth while, some of these voices, jackal-like sit in high places in the local councils of government, but the significant thing about them is that they have offered no constructive suggestions about anything, much less postfair residual end-use ideas. Yet, this report I now place into the RECORD cannot be denied. I offer it now:

SAN ANTONIO
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
San Antonio, Tex.

DEAR CHAMBER MEMBER: Was it worth it?

This question has been asked many times as to whether HemisFair '68 was really worth all the time, effort, and money in the planning, development, and implementation of our World's Fair.

Today we are providing you with statistical and economic data we have been able to compile as it relates to the impact of HemisFair on San Antonio.

You will agree that it is impossible for us to completely itemize and evaluate the many indirect benefits that might have been generated by the Fair. Neither can we put a dollar mark on the worldwide exposure and publicity that San Antonio gained.

Of all the individuals and groups that have been recognized, none is due greater recognition than those San Antonio businessmen who were the underwriters. HemisFair could have been staged without some people, but not without the underwriters. San Antonio will be forever indebted to these individuals.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. STEEN,
President.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express,
Oct. 7, 1968]

FAIR DECIDEDLY WORTH STAGING SOLELY FOR CITY'S ECONOMIC GAIN

As with any post mortem, HemisFair's history cannot be accurately assessed immediately. And it is probably unfair to use the term, post mortem, anyway, because there will be a lively part of the fair around for a long time.

The least one should accept is that it was a dazzling fair that got a lot of things moving and got a lot of people who wouldn't be caught associating with each other being rather intimately acquainted.

Concretely, the fair generated jobs, new income for the city and state treasury, increased retail sales, salaries, travel and general business activity. These are measurable items.

The city, alone, collected or will collect on the six-month fair approximately \$1,260,000 from added sales taxes, parking lot profits and hotel room tax. Also there is an added \$100,000 a year in taxes from new property put on the rolls directly because of the fair.

Our town added some \$12 million worth of construction at the fair that will return an anticipated \$25 million a year within the next two or three years. We would have built the convention center in any case because we

needed it to compete in one of the industries for which the city is best suited to compete.

The fair wasn't a shot of permanent magic and nobody claims so. It was a substantial start on a long road this community needs to take on a job of boot-strapping the economy from out of the bottom quarter of the nation. The fair demonstrated that such a task is merely difficult, not impossible.

Unfortunately, only 99⁴/₁₀₀ per cent of our people think the fair was magnificent. The other minute portion is still trying to find something wrong that can be converted into political leverage. Express-News Writer Kemper Diehl dug among the circle of known critics seeking the other side of the balance sheet. He found virtually nothing to refute the claim that the fair was worth the time and effort it took.

Those persons who made the fair happen can take pride in their achievement. There was Marshall Steves who did a magnificent job securing the first underwriting and handling some of the painful personnel and management problems; and H. B. Zachry, whose know-how and resourcefulness saw the project through to a commendable conclusion; and all those in between and along beside.

There will be an inevitable letdown for awhile but the city will be far better off from here on for having had the fair.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Sunday Light,
Oct. 6, 1968]

A FOND FAREWELL

Today after a six-month run, and a highly successful one by any reasonable standards, San Antonio's World's Fair—HemisFair '68—closes its gates.

All of those hard-working fair executives and employees who labored to make HemisFair a success should be congratulated by San Antonians and all Texas for a job well done.

The fair was an artistic triumph and all knowledgeable persons have so proclaimed it from its inception.

Tremendous long term benefits will accrue to San Antonio from the overall HemisFair project.

Development of the convention center, the Tower of the Americas, the extension of the river, clearance of blighted structures in the area and permanent improvements to the fairgrounds will continue to bring pleasure and economic benefits to citizens of San Antonio for many decades to come.

From the standpoint of its more than 6-million visitors, the fair was extremely well conceived.

In the broadest sense, the fair should be considered a tremendous success.

Again we say to all who had a hand in its production: "Well done!"

ECONOMIC BENEFITS FROM HEMISFAIR '68 (Compiled by San Antonio Chamber of Commerce)

DIRECT BENEFITS FROM HEMISFAIR '68 RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION, EMPLOYMENT, VISITOR IMPACT, ACCOMMODATIONS INDUSTRY, TRAVEL INDUSTRY

Listed below are some of the major construction projects that were carried out on the HemisFair grounds.

Convention center complex.....	\$15,000,000
The Institute of Texan Cultures	12,000,000
Confluence Theatre and the Exhibit Hall (U.S. Pavilion)	7,500,000
Tower of the Americas.....	5,500,000

The above figures added to construction projects for pavilions, landscaping, parking lots and other related facilities amounted to a total construction expenditure on the Fair site of \$71,355,900.

CONSTRUCTION EMPLOYMENT

While there is no complete breakdown on total construction employment figures for the Fair, we received information from the HemisFair staff stating that the average number of workers from February 1967 to April 1968 was 2,040 employees per month. During peak construction in November of 1967 there were 7,900 construction employees on the site, not including engineers, surveyors, architects, city inspectors or foremen.

HEMISFAIR EMPLOYMENT

Nearly 10,000 people, on the average, were working as employees of the many concessionaires, governmental exhibitors and industrial exhibitors during the period of the Fair. Broken down as follows:

Monthly average concessionaire employees	7,796
Monthly average, industrial exhibitors	1,071
Monthly average, governmental exhibitors	703

Total monthly average..... 9,570

(Does not include employees of San Antonio Fair, Inc.)

From a modest beginning in 1964 when the first staff members were employed and continuing through the end of 1967, when approximately 230 people were on the staff, total San Antonio Fair, Inc. payroll had amounted to \$1,930,000 for the period. Since January, 1968, and continuing through the end of the Fair, total San Antonio Fair, Inc. payroll amounted to \$3,700,000. During April the peak employment of nearly 2,400 was reached.

VISITOR IMPACT

Listed below is information on the place of residence of visitors to HemisFair '68.

	Survey period, Apr. 6 to Oct. 2 (percent)	Total attendance, Apr. 6 to Oct. 6
San Antonio-Bexar County.....	23.2	1,481,200
Other Texas.....	35.5	2,266,491
Subtotal (Texas).....	58.7	3,747,691
Southwest (Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma).....	8.4	536,297
Pacific (California, Oregon, Hawaii, Alaska, and Washington).....	3.7	236,226
Mountain (New Mexico, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, Arizona, and Utah).....	3.4	217,072
West North Central (North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri).....	4.8	306,455
East North Central (Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana).....	6.3	402,222
East South Central (Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama).....	3.1	197,919
Middle Atlantic (New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania).....	2.5	159,612
South Atlantic (Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida).....	4.5	287,302
New England States.....	.4	25,538
Foreign.....	4.2	268,148
Subtotal (outside Texas).....	41.3	2,636,791
Total.....	100.0	6,384,482

It is interesting to note that 23% of the total attendance came from San Antonio and Bexar County, and 35% came from other points throughout the State of Texas. This indicates that slightly less than 50% of the total of 6,384,482 came from states outside of Texas as well as a sizeable number of foreign visitors. For many this was a first time visit to San Antonio. Not only did they visit HemisFair, but reports from other major tourist attractions, indicate they spent extra time in seeing our cities numerous attractions. To substantiate this we have information that the Spanish Governors Palace approximately doubled their attendance in 1968 over 1967. Attendance to the Alamo showed an increase of two million visitors over the comparable period in 1967. Mission Concepcion's annual attendance has never exceeded 6,000, but for the six month run of the Fair the total was 41,000. The Hall of Horns had a 61% increase with their guest book showing visitors coming from all 50 states and nineteen foreign countries.

Out of town visitors according to a HemisFair '68 study indicated that 4,903,000 visitors came from outside of San Antonio and Bexar County. The majority of these traveled by private automobile, contributing greatly to increased retail sales in the service station industry. In checking with local firms, we also find there was a substantial increase in business by car rental, taxicab, and commercial bus companies. Considerable new business accrued to local travel agencies and tourguide firms through organized individual and group tour packages sold to HemisFair visitors.

If each of the 4,900,000 out of county visitors stayed only one day in San Antonio, and if each visitor spent an average of \$25 that one day, a total of \$122,500,000 would have been injected into the local economy.

A substantial increase was noted in airline traffic. In 1966 domestic passengers at San Antonio International Airport reached 536,757, in 1967 the total was 584,279. Through the first eight months of 1968 domestic passengers had totaled 519,002, an actual increase over the comparable period in 1967 of 34.6%. In International boardings the eight months of 1968 have totaled 47,719 compared with 27,013 for the same period in 1967, a gain of 22,706 or 84.1% increase.

One major airline in San Antonio stated that their San Antonio business through the first seven months of 1968 increased by 30% over the comparable period in 1967. Since the Fair opened this company added 31 employees to assist with the increased traffic. Another airline stated that for the first seven months of 1968 their traffic was up 75% over the comparable 1967 period.

RELATED BENEFITS

Hotels and motels

Since the first of 1967, more than 2,170 new motel units were added to the motel units available in San Antonio. A partial list of the new and expanded units is below.

During the same period, 672 hotel rooms were added to the San Antonio inventory.

Assuming an average construction cost of \$5,000 for each hotel and motel unit, over \$14,000,000 in new accommodation facilities have been constructed (2,842 x \$5,000). Using the anticipated city tax rate of \$1.89 per \$100.00 valuation, and an assessment ratio of 45%, annual property tax revenue of approximately \$119,000 should result to the City of San Antonio. Other taxing agencies, Bexar County, independent school districts and others will realize additional tax revenue because of the added valuations.

Also during the pre-HemisFair period, more than 1,200 permanent trailer or camper units were constructed, with another 1,500 constructed on a temporary basis. The permanent facilities will fill a void that has existed since this rapidly developing concept of camper travel began.

Hotel rooms added:	
Palacio del Rio (new).....	496
Menger Hotel (addition).....	111
Crockett Motor Inn (new).....	65
Total	672
Motor hotel/motel units added:	
Holiday Inn:	
Downtown (new).....	325
Northeast (addition).....	62
Northwest (addition).....	62
Pa Posada Motor Hotel (new).....	180
La Quinta Motor Inn:	
Downtown (new).....	125
North (new).....	128
Rodeway Inn:	
N. Panam Exp. (new).....	95
Northwest Exp. (new).....	106
N. Main (addition).....	32
Travelodge:	
IH35 (now Rio Motel) (new).....	124
Northwest (new).....	63
Elmira Motor Hotel (addition).....	52
Travelodge, Broadway (new).....	83
Total	1,437

New tax dollars

As was stated in the previous section we will see an increase of tax revenue from new Hotel and Motel construction alone amounting to over \$100,000.00. In the past three years we have experienced a boom in overall construction. Only a portion of this was actual HemisFair construction. The creation of the Fair has resulted in an overall economic increase in the City resulting in related new construction in restaurants, apartment complexes, and commercial and residential construction. While we cannot pinpoint the increase in taxes from this construction, it of course would be a sizeable figure. The following section on General Statistics will bear out this overall economic increase. As stated in the previous section other taxing agencies, such as Bexar County, independent school districts and others will realize additional tax revenue as a result of this new construction.

Sales tax

An estimate from City Officials indicates that as much as \$750,000 in additional sales

tax revenue will accrue to the City as a result of increased retail sales activity generated by HemisFair visitors.

Hotel-motel occupancy tax

The 1% voluntary tax agreed to by the San Antonio Hotel-Motel Industry to be set aside for San Antonio's Convention promotion amounted to \$122,766.00 for the period April 1, 1968 through August, 1968.

GENERAL ECONOMIC STATISTICS

Retail sales

San Antonio's retail sales as estimated by the Bureau of Business Research, the University of Texas, have increased as follows:

	1966	1967	1968
January.....	\$73,639,000	\$77,855,000	\$86,115,000
February.....	75,849,000	76,560,000	88,961,000
March.....	106,532,000	122,555,000	134,345,000
April.....	98,160,000	99,121,000	123,085,000
May.....	104,433,000	115,831,000	134,594,000
June.....	103,384,000	112,970,000	123,505,000
July.....	103,585,000	112,547,000	128,622,000
7 months.....	665,582,000	717,439,000	819,227,000

Seven months of 1968 are up 14.2% over seven months of 1967.

Business-activity index

According to the Texas Business Review, Bureau of Business Research, The University of Texas, the Business Activity Index of San Antonio has experienced the following changes:

April 1966.....	162.7
April 1967.....	160.8
April 1968.....	189.4
July 1968.....	211.0

The index is based on bank debits reported by the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas and adjusted for seasonal variation and changes in the price level by the Bureau of Business Research.

Employment

The District Office of the Texas Employment Commission has supplied the following data relating to employment in the San Antonio Labor Market since 1966:

GENERAL ECONOMIC STATISTICS

	April 1966	April 1967	April 1968	July 1968	Percent change April 1966 to July 1968
Total employment.....	251,390	265,190	277,580	279,990	+11.4
Wage and salary employees.....	215,350	228,720	240,900	243,160	+12.9
Employed in:					
Manufacturing.....	26,290	27,330	29,270	29,580	+12.5
Construction.....	14,160	14,690	15,720	14,970	+5.7
Retail trade.....	31,425	33,240	35,240	36,240	+15.3
Restaurants.....	7,925	8,170	8,980	9,050	+14.2
Services.....	31,525	34,005	38,530	39,680	+25.9
Hotels-motels.....	3,085	12,735	3,520	3,850	+24.8

¹ Reflects loss due to closing of 1 of the major downtown hotels.

Construction

Since the beginning of 1966 and continuing through August 1968, construction contracts amounting to \$491,036,000 have been awarded in Bexar County. Of this, \$206,245,000 has been in non-residential construction and \$192,972,000 in residential construction with the remainder in public works and utilities construction.

Year	Total construction	Non-residential	Residential
1965.....	\$148,574,000	\$57,945,000	\$52,686,000
1966.....	177,481,000	76,878,000	52,503,000
1967.....	180,872,000	72,625,000	74,917,000
1968 (8 months).....	132,683,000	56,742,000	65,552,000

Source: F. W. Dodge Corp. reports.

Bank deposits:

June 29, 1968.....	\$1,182,991,000
Dec. 30, 1967.....	1,163,922,000
Dec. 31, 1966.....	1,039,071,000
Dec. 31, 1965.....	1,030,306,000

Bank clearings:

9 months, 1968.....	9,910,096,400
1967.....	11,650,154,405
1966.....	11,195,456,139
1965.....	10,471,208,868

New motor vehicle sales:

9 months, 1968.....	32,186
1967.....	34,501
1966.....	33,907
1965.....	33,367

INDIRECT BENEFITS

Convention Center

The Fair, of course, was the catalyst that created San Antonio's Convention Center that is undoubtedly one of the finest and

most practical complexes in the United States. This facility will now enable us to bid for 90% of all the conventions held in the country. Already we have booked extremely large convention groups that would have been impossible in the past. We now have approximately 7,000 rooms available with 2,842 new, permanent hotel and motel rooms constructed as a result of the Fair. In checking with the Convention Bureau we find that we definitely are booking larger conventions, such as the State Bar of Texas in 1970 that will bring 4,000 delegates to the City at one time, or the Texas State Teachers Association in 1969 that will bring in over 6,000 delegates. There are numerous other examples that could be cited from the hundreds of advance convention bookings. Let us consider the economic impact that these two groups alone will mean to the City. When you consider that each delegate spends approximately \$30.00 per day, these two groups will bring in over one million new dollars to San Antonio's economy.

HemisFair VIP program

This national promotion program was created by the Chamber of Commerce and the City Public Service Board to attract business executives to HemisFair. The ultimate goal was to have an opportunity to meet these executives and show them the assets we have for business location in San Antonio. The program was a success, and we now have a number of excellent prospects that could result in new business and industry for the City.

Urban renewal credits

Urban renewal projects are financed $\frac{1}{3}$ by the City and $\frac{2}{3}$ by Federal funds. A city may in lieu of cash payments construct civic projects within urban renewal projects areas. On the 140 acres cleared as the Civic Center urban renewal project the City of San Antonio will receive credits from the Federal Government on construction projects such as the Convention Center, Parking Garage, parking lots, utilities, and rebuilding of streets. The amount of credit to be received by the City on these projects should amount to approximately \$8,000,000.00. The City's $\frac{1}{3}$ share of this project will amount to approximately \$6,000,000.00. This will give the City a surplus of \$2,000,000.00 in credits to apply on the Rosa Verde and Vista Verde urban renewal projects. This credit will eliminate the need for the City to make cash payments for their share of the above urban renewal projects.

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC BENEFITS FROM HEMISFAIR '68

Total construction on the HemisFair site amounted to \$71,355,900.00.

Total construction since the beginning of 1966 through August of 1968 amounted to \$491,036,000.00.

Over 10,000 people on the average were working as employees of concessionaires, governmental exhibitors, industrial exhibitors, and Fair employees during the six month period of the Fair.

Visitors from outside Bexar County amounted to 4,903,000.

It is estimated these visitors spent a total of \$122,500,000.00 while in San Antonio.

A tremendous increase was registered in airline traffic during the period of the Fair. Through eight months of 1967 there was an average of 48,186 domestic boardings per month at International Airport, compared to 64,875 per month during the eight months of 1968. An overall increase of 34.6% over a like period for 1967.

Since the first of 1967, 2,842 new motel and hotel units were added to the accommodations industry in San Antonio.

The construction on these new motel and hotel units amounted to over \$14,000,000.00.

The property tax revenue on these motel and hotel units will amount to over \$100,000.00 per year to the City of San Antonio.

Other taxing agencies, such as Bexar County and a number of the independent

school districts, will realize considerable additional tax revenue from all private construction relating to HemisFair.

An estimate from City Officials indicates that as much as \$750,000.00 in additional sales tax revenue could be realized as a result of increased retail sales generated by HemisFair visitors.

San Antonio's Convention Center became a reality as a result of HemisFair.

It is a proven fact that this new convention facility will assist in attracting new and larger convention groups, thus bringing millions of new dollars into San Antonio's economy.

The HemisFair VIP Program resulted in new business and industrial prospects.

Of the estimated \$8,000,000.00 in urban renewal credits accruing from HemisFair construction by the City, approximately \$6,000,000.00 will apply on the one-third share of the Civic Center project. This leaves a balance of \$2,000,000.00 in credits that can be applied on additional urban renewal projects.

In retail sales we had an increase of over \$100,000,000.00 for the like period during 1967, an increase of 14.2%.

The business activity index compiled by the Bureau of Business Research shows a jump from 160.8 in April of 1967 to 211.0 in July of 1968.

Total employment was at an all time high in July of 1968 showing considerable percentage increases in practically all employment groups.

Bank deposits were at an all time high in the summer of 1968 with the total being \$1,182,991,000.00.

Through September 1968, bank clearings had reached nearly \$10,000,000,000.00 running approximately 14% over the like period for 1967.

Was it worth it?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEPPER, for December 1 through December 8, on account of official business, Crime Committee work.

Mr. HOSMER, for 10 days commencing December 1, on account of eye surgery.

Mr. SANDMAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of December 1, on account of official business as delegate to the Inter-Governmental Committee on European Migration.

Mr. RAILSBACK (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of December 1, on account of official business as delegate to the Inter-Governmental Committee on European Migration.

Mr. MESKILL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of December 1, on account of official business as a delegate to the Inter-Governmental Committee on European Migration.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCLOSKEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROE), to revise and extend

their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEEDS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCLOSKEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. KEITH in three instances.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. WYATT in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in three instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. BRADEMANS in six instances.

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. FARSTEIN in four instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. HICKS in two instances.

Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE.

Mr. OLSEN.

Mr. SCHEUER.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2276. An act to extend for 1 year the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles under the provisions of the Clean Air Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on December 1 next.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, the House adjourned until Monday, December 1, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8022. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to certain members of the uniformed services for dependents' schooling, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9654. A bill to authorize subsistence, without charge, to certain air evacuation patients; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 14996. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14997. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (for himself, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. ABERNETHY, and Mr. DOWDY):

H.R. 14998. A bill to require an applicant for a permit to hold a demonstration, parade, march, or vigil on Federal property or in the District of Columbia to post a bond to cover certain costs of such demonstration, parade, march, or vigil; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 14999. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit medical electronic data services to participate in the administration of benefits under the program of health insurance for the aged in the same way as health insurance carriers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HOMER, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUTH, Mr. FREY, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MYERS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 15000. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any of certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is given by the next of kin of the serviceman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUNT, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. FISHER):

H.R. 15001. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any of certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is

given by the next of kin of the serviceman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. ROUEBUSH, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BROCK):

H.R. 15002. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any of certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is given by the next of kin of the serviceman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 15003. A bill to amend certain Federal laws relating to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 15004. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 15005. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase, in the case of individuals having 40 or more quarters of coverage, the number of years which may be disregarded in computing such individual's average monthly wage, and to provide that, for benefit computation purposes, a man's insured status and average monthly wage will be figured on the basis of an age-62 cutoff (the same as presently provided in the case of women); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 15006. A bill to amend section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, to provide a 5-percent increase in certain annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 15007. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to clarify the application of tax on transfer of funds to a U.S. corporation from a Guam subsidiary; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 15008. A bill to establish the Plymouth-Provincetown Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

H.R. 15009. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for the adoption of national standards governing emissions from stationary sources, to create a Federal duty not to pollute the atmosphere, to provide additional public and private remedies for the abatement of air pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 15010. A bill to waive the statute of limitations with respect to a certain claim against the United States by the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 15011. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 15012. A bill to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the National Park System to commemorate the opening of the Cherokee Strip to homesteading, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 15013. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KEITH, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. PREYER of North Carolina):

H.R. 15014. A bill to amend the United States Code, title 49, section 1472, which is titled "Criminal Penalties Generally"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 15015. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide pensions for widows of certain retired members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 15016. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, in order to improve the judicial machinery of military courts-martial by removing defense counsel and jury selection from the control of a military commander who convenes a court-martial and by creating an independent trial command for the purpose of preventing command influence or the appearance of command influence from adversely affecting the fairness of military judicial proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 15017. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any of certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is given by the next of kin of the serviceman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 15018. A bill to designate Route 74 of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the State of Illinois as the Everett McKinley Dirksen Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. REES, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. McFALL, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. BROWN of California):

H.R. 15019. A bill to designate the San Joaquin Wilderness, Sierra National Forest, and Inyo National Forest in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 1015. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 1016. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 457. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress condemning the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BRADEN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. YATES, Mr. O'HARA, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H. Res. 730. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. McCLOSKEY introduced a bill (H.R. 15020) for the relief of Mrs. Edith Berke, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

342. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thomas G. Staley, Eagle Point, Oreg., relative to preservation of the Rogue River in Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

343. Also, petition of Louis Teplitzky, Bronx, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: A BACKGROUND SERIES—II, III, IV

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Congressional Reorganization of the Committee on Rules has now completed its draft bill on congressional reorganization. Because of many requests by Members interested in congressional reform, and in order to be of help to these Members, I am inserting into the RECORD three items of background information: First, the final report of the first Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, dated March 5, 1946, which accompanied S. 2177, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; second, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and third, a report by Dr. George B. Galloway during the 1951 hearings on the Evaluation of the Effects of Laws Enacted To Reorganize the Legislative Branch of the Government.

The special subcommittee headed by the Honorable B. F. SISK has held 5 days of public hearings on their preprint of the reform bill and has scheduled 3 more days of hearings for December 3, 4, and 5. In the near future this draft will be recommended to the full Rules Committee, which I hope will report it to the House for action in January of 1970. It is for this reason that I feel that the following information, along with other material to be inserted into the RECORD by my colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), will be especially useful to Members of the House:

CALENDAR NO. 1427: LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

The Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The most important amendment made by the special committee was to eliminate from the bill Title VII—Self-Government for the District of Columbia. The Committee on the Judiciary has favorably reported a bill, S. 1942, to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission. Title VII of S. 2177 and S. 1942 are similar measures, having the same objective of home rule for the District of Columbia. Attainment of this desirable objective will be expedited, we believe, by the enactment of S. 1942.

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 2177 incorporates the recommendations contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress Report No. 1011 of March 4, 1946. This report was based upon a year's full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States. Its almost unanimous findings and recommendations reflect

a consensus of opinion among Members of Congress, political scientists, efficiency engineers, and students of government concerning the conditions that handicap Congress in the performance of its proper functions and suitable remedies.

Since 1941 a series of independent surveys of the machinery and methods of our National Legislature have been made by public and private organizations. These surveys, including that by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, have reached substantially the same conclusions as to the defects in our legislative structure and operation and as to appropriate correctives. They are agreed that Congress today is neither organized nor equipped to perform adequately its main functions of determining policy, authorizing administrative organizations to carry out policy, and supervising execution of the resultant programs.

Devised to handle the simpler tasks of an earlier day, our legislative machinery and procedures are by common consent no longer competent to cope satisfactorily with the grave and complex problems of the post-war world. They must be modernized if we are to avoid an imminent break-down of the legislative branch of the National Government.

Determining policy

Cited as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, S. 2177 is designed to reconvert our inherited and outmoded congressional machinery to the needs of today. One group of provisions deals with strengthening the policy determining function of Congress. Because of the volume and specialized character of the legislative business, Congress has logically delegated the initial work of policy making to standing committees of its Members. These committees have had a long and useful history, some of them dating back to the early days of the Republic. There have been several major and minor reorganizations of the congressional committee system through the years, as new problems have arisen and old ones have disappeared. The system has not been revamped to meet mod-

ern needs and conditions, however, since 1921. It is now in need of a complete overhaul to enable Congress to handle efficiently the expanding problems of the postwar world.

Today there are more than twice as many standing committees in the Senate as there are principal provinces of public policy. Responsibility for legislative action is scattered among 33 little legislatures which go their own way at their own pace and cannot act in concert. Their jurisdictions are undefined in the Senate rules, and there are many committees functioning in the same problem areas. For example, three Senate committees deal with problems of commerce and industry, five deal with public land problems, and six with the rules and administration of the Senate. Furthermore, some committees are inactive and seldom or never meet.

To remedy this crazy-quilt pattern, S. 2177 would replace our jerry-built committee structure with a simplified system of standing committees corresponding with the major areas of public policy and administration and having authority to hold joint hearings with the parallel committees of the House of Representatives on matters of common interest. The correlation of the committee systems of the two Chambers with each other would facilitate joint action on specific measures by means of joint hearings.

It would also increase the efficiency of the committee structure, facilitate closer liaison between the two Houses, and economize the time of busy legislators and administrators alike. And the coordination of the congressional committee system with the pattern of the administrative branch of the National Government would improve the performance by Congress of its legislative and supervisory functions, provide direct channels of communication and cooperation between the two branches, promote more harmonious and unified action in the development of public policies, and go a long way to bridge the gap between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

CONSOLIDATION OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Existing committees	Reorganized committees
1. Agriculture and Forestry.....	1. Agriculture and Forestry.
2. Appropriations.....	2. Appropriations.
3. Military Affairs.....	3. Armed Services.
4. Naval Affairs.....	4. Banking and Currency.
5. Banking and Currency.....	5. Civil Service.
6. Civil Service.....	6. District of Columbia.
7. Post Offices and Post Roads.....	7. Expenditures in Executive Departments.
8. District of Columbia.....	8. Finance.
9. Expenditures in the Executive Departments.....	9. Foreign Relations.
10. Finance.....	10. Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
11. Foreign Relations.....	11. Judiciary.
12. Interstate Commerce.....	12. Labor and Public Welfare.
13. Commerce.....	13. Public Lands.
14. Inter-oceanic Canals.....	14. Public Works.
15. Manufactures.....	15. Rules and Administration.
16. Judiciary.....	16. Veterans' Affairs.
17. Patents.....	(Abolished.)
18. Immigration.....	
19. Education and Labor.....	
20. Public Lands and Surveys.....	
21. Mines and Mining.....	
22. Territories and Insular Affairs.....	
23. Irrigation and Reclamation.....	
24. Indian Affairs.....	
25. Public Buildings and Grounds.....	
26. Rules.....	
27. Audit and Control.....	
28. Library.....	
29. Privileges and Elections.....	
30. Printing.....	
31. Enrolled Bills.....	
32. Pensions.....	
33. Claims.....	